

# THE BERLIN REFUGE 1680–1780

LEARNING AND SCIENCE  
IN EUROPEAN CONTEXT



*edited by*

SANDRA POTT, MARTIN MULSOW  
AND  
LUTZ DANNEBERG

BRILL

THE BERLIN REFUGE 1680-1780

# BRILL'S STUDIES IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

*General Editor*

A.J. VANDERJAGT, University of Groningen

*Editorial Board*

M. COLISH, Oberlin College

J.I. ISRAEL, University College, London

J.D. NORTH, University of Groningen

R.H. POPKIN, Washington University, St. Louis-UCLA

VOLUME 114



# THE BERLIN REFUGE

## 1680-1780

*Learning and Science in European Context*

EDITED BY

SANDRA POTT, MARTIN MULSOW,  
AND LUTZ DANNEBERG



BRILL  
LEIDEN · BOSTON  
2003

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

The Berlin refuge, 1680-1780 : learning and science in European context / edited by Sandra Pott, Martin Mulsow, and Lutz Danneberg.

p. cm. – (Brill's studies in intellectual history ; v. 114)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 90-04-12561-2

1. Berlin (Germany)–Intellectual life. 2. Religious tolerance. 3.

Huguenots–Germany–Berlin–History–18th century. 4. Philosophy, Germany–18th century. 5. Enlightenment–Germany–Berlin. I. Pott, Sandra. II. Mulsow, Martin. III. Danneberg, Lutz. IV. Series.

DD866.8..B55 2003

943'.15505'088245–dc21

2003045371

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 90 04 12561 2

© Copyright 2003 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	vii
<i>Sandra Pott</i>	

### I

#### INTRODUCTION

“Gentle, refined, cultivated, witty people”: Comments on the Intellectual History of the Berlin <i>Refuge</i> and on Relevant Research .....	3
<i>Sandra Pott</i>	

Views of the Berlin <i>Refuge</i> : Scholarly Projects, Literary Interests, Marginal Fields .....	25
<i>Martin Mulzow</i>	

### II

#### THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

Ezechiel Spanheim’s Dispute with Richard Simon. On the Biblical Philology at the End of the 17th Century .....	49
<i>Lutz Danneberg</i>	

Temporizing After Bayle: Isaac de Beausobre and the Manicheans .....	89
<i>John Christian Laursen</i>	

## III

## HISTORY AND NATURAL LAW

Ein vergessener Pufendorf-Übersetzer: der <i>Réfugié</i> Antoine Teissier .....	113
<i>Fiammetta Palladini</i>	
Natural Right, Liberty of Conscience and “Summa Potestas” in Jean Barbeyrac .....	137
<i>Fabrizio Lomonaco</i>	

## IV

## DISSEMINATION AND POPULARISATION

Der <i>Refuge</i> und der Journalismus um 1700: Gabriel d’Artis (ca. 1650–ca. 1730) .....	155
<i>Herbert Jaumann</i>	
Lektüre, Bildung, Wissenskanon: Jean-Henri-Samuel Formeys Ratschläge zum Aufbau einer Privatbibliothek im 18. Jahrhundert .....	183
<i>Annett Volmer</i>	
The Huguenot Clerisy in the United Provinces: Aspects of Huguenot Influence on Dutch Intellectual Life After the Revocation .....	207
<i>Joris van Eijnatten</i>	
Index of Names .....	237

## PREFACE\*

Sandra Pott

Fleeing from France after the revocation of the *Edict of Nantes* (1685), the ‘Huguenots’ were admitted into the countries of Western-Europe—not only thanks to charity of a Protestant brotherhood, but also because the refugees had a lot to offer: They were well-educated people both in the practical professions and in science. In the Holy Roman Empire, clever monarchs began to realise the great potential which the refugees had and could contribute to their country’s progress. These monarchs were suddenly in the position of being able to found French-speaking Protestant communities. On the one hand, the *Refuge* meant the *Exodus* of learned Protestant elites from France. On the other hand, several German regions profited considerably from it, the *Refuge* becoming a means of providing intellectual support for those regions.—We shall be considering this thesis.

This book, therefore, will concentrate on the biggest centre of the *Refuge* in Germany: on Berlin—with reference to Brandenburg-Prussia. It was here, that Frederick William I (“the Great Elector”, 1640–1688), Frederick William II (1713–1740), and Frederick II (“the Great”, 1740–1786), turned Calvinism into the ‘estate’s ideology’. As far as Calvinism—with Max Weber—is to be understood as a mode of believing and living ‘rationally’,<sup>1</sup> it fitted well into the monarch’s plans of building up a stable and efficient regime. And it is not by mere accident, that Prussian and ‘Calvinist’ ethics share several characteristics such as self-discipline and emphasis on performance rather than on more emotional virtues.

However in this region, belief, thought, and intellectual practices were more complex. In the French-Protestant community of Berlin, erudites rapidly established ‘networks’ which pursued a very wide

---

\* For proof-reading I wish to thank Philipp Schaefer.

<sup>1</sup> For Weber’s influential interpretation see Max Weber: Die religiösen Grundlagen der innerweltlichen Askese, in: M. W., Die protestantische Ethik I. Eine Aufsatzsammlung, ed. Johannes Winckelmann. Gütersloh 6th Ed. 1981, pp. 115–190.



range of intellectual interest. The refugees had to adapt to the circumstances they found themselves in, contending with their own 'broken biographies' and with the Latin-speaking *res publica litteraria* in Germany and elsewhere. When comparing the standard *res publica's* publications and the ones written by French Protestants, we can see that they differ only in a few aspects. Like their Lutheran contemporaries and their Catholic precursors, the French Protestants represented a Moderate Enlightenment, but also longed for 'irrational' topics (myths, erotic literature etc.) and for the *nouvelles littéraires* (news and gossip). One could be forgiven for thinking that this light relief was justified for rigid morals. Having made this observation, we cannot deny the truth in Weber's diagnosis. Taking into account the French-Protestant dogmatic scriptures (e.g. Philippe Naudé's writing against Leibniz) or the pro-Calvinist historiography (e.g. Antoine Teissier's efforts), one could easily be convinced of several core beliefs which constituted the Reformed doctrine and which were supposed to enter into all fields of life and knowledge.

The introductory part of this volume allows me to abridge here. Martin Mulsow and I shall indicate the topic and desiderata for research. Both contributions complement each other. Whereas Martin Mulsow presents the wide range of 'rational' and 'irrational' motives of the *Refuge* and proposes an analytic model to find out about its intellectual constellations, I try to find out about the characteristics of the *Berlin Refuge* which are—presumably—responsible for its fall and rise. The *Berlin Refuge* did not remain in its original form; it changed considerably—and seemed to be dissolving at the end of the 18th century. By the end of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century the *Refuge* could be seen as a multi-layered, many-faced, and many-sided community that was to a certain extent—unlike the Lutherans—organised on an international level. However, by the end of the 18th century, it had lost its characteristics through assimilation into the new environment, looking for unification with all Protestants, promoting tolerance, natural right, morals, science, and aesthetic self-reflection.

The present volume explores the history and the prehistory of this development. It is—in part—a revision of Erich Haase's *Einführung in die Literatur des Refuge* (postum 1959), but it aims to combine a traditional history of ideas like Haase's *Einführung* with regional history, current cultural, and 'clandestine' research. As is often the case in Early Modern Europe, only through regional history can we discover

contexts of texts, ideas, individuals, developments etc. By taking all of these regional aspects into account, our research on the *Berlin Refuge* aims to participate in the efforts to (re-)establish a comprehensive intellectual history.

Since this book is the latest in a number of publications on the *Refuge*,<sup>2</sup> it is necessary to emphasise that the title is not meant to claim completeness of coverage or authority. However, the articles introduce the major issues and debates in the various fields of knowledge of the refugees. Some of these articles are short biographies on authors which have been forgotten for quite a long time. They provide unpublished material (letters and excerpts) or tables (on journals edited by French Protestants and on French-Protestant academic staff) and are arranged according to the various fields of knowledge.

Following the traditional order of the sciences, theology and philosophy are the *artes* with which we should begin: Lutz Danneberg's contribution deals with the ways of explaining the age and estate of the Holy Scripture. In the late 17th century, Conflict arose between two tendencies of biblical philology, one more or less 'orthodox' (Ezechiel Spanheim, 1629–1710) and another more or less critical (Ludovicus Cappellus, Richard Simon, Baruch de Spinoza, Jean LeClerc). Whereas Spanheim tried to rescue the age and authenticity of the Masoretic text for reasons of belief, Cappellus and Simon doubted it. Even if Spanheim—from today's perspective—was on the loser's side, his position was not unreasonable. He was hoping for Providence, denying any distinction between theology and philology, having in mind a specific doctrine of testimony. Referring to the example of Spanheim, Lutz Danneberg observes the broad field of Protestant hermeneutics that had been dominated by the *hermeneutica sacra* until—in the 17th century—*hermeneutica generalis* claimed its own right.

The next example represents a middle position between "rationalism" and orthodox orientation. In his *Critical History of Manichée and Manicheism* (1734–1739), the theologian Isaac de Beausobre deals with one of the most important heresies in early Christian times. John Christian Laursen explains why Beausobre wrote a—moderate—apology for Mani and shows how he turned Mani into a Christian martyr. Adopting Pierre Bayle's interest in this heresy and

---

<sup>2</sup> The large number of publications is mentioned in the contributions so that I can spare this out here.

borrowing Bayle's vocabulary, Beausobre nevertheless seems to agree and disagree with Bayle at the same time. The reason for Beausobres differentiated self-positioning is to be found in his belief in as well as his attitude towards historical texts. He was 'obsessed' with sources, always looking for the historical truth and criticising the various histories on the early heresies from this point of view. And yet, his defence of Manicheism is biased by his own Protestant, tolerant, and temporising approach. John Christian Laursen calls this "proto-liberalism", with critical reference to what John G. A. Pocock had described as "liberal Protestantism". One of the main reasons for John Christian Laursen's daring—yet careful—attribution lies in Beausobre's art of writing history. When we draw comparisons to other French Protestants, namely Antoine Teissier, it may seem appropriate to portray Beausobre as a "proto-Liberal".

Following the revocation, Teissier, lawyer and former member of the Academy of Nîmes, *gazettier* in Zurich and Bern, wanted to write the history of the "Great Elector". As a friend of the orthodox Zurich theologian Johann Heinrich Heidegger, he was attracted by Frederick William's sympathy for the Calvinists. But, upon arrival in Berlin, he discovered Frederick William's history had already been written by someone else: *De rebus Friderici Wilhelmi Magni Electori Brandenburgici* by Samuel von Pufendorf was published in 1695. This was the reason why Teissier gave up his own plan and—astonishingly—translated Pufendorf's history. Furthermore, on the request of several Zurich professors, Teissier also published French versions of Pufendorf's *De habitu religionis christianae ad vitam civilem* (1687)/*Traité de la Religion Chretienne par rapport à la vie Civile* (1690), and of Pufendorf's manual *De officio hominis et civis* (1673)/*Les Devoirs des hommes et des citoyens* (1696)—omitting the controversial preface, and before Jean Barbeyrac was even able to plan his 'enlightened' French version (published in 1707). Teissier's example gives an insight into the dynamics of orthodoxy itself: On the one hand, the 'translator' limits himself to his own dogmatic canon. On the other hand, not only enlightened erudites like Barbeyrac, but also the orthodox 'mediated' between the different Protestant traditions, cultures, and churches—even if the orthodox 'mediation' differed from the quite open-minded one of the Moderate Enlightenment.

Fabrizio Lomonaco explains what distinguished the orthodox from the enlightened, referring not only to the history of law doctrines but also to their systematic development in the light of a general process

of emancipation from theology. His example is Barbeyrac. Following Lomonaco, the legal theorist—one the one hand—defended the conformity of reason, conscience, and divine law. On the other hand, he pleaded for juridical thinking that stimulated secularisation of political and moral life. It is his rationalism that holds both tendencies together. Therefore, *summa potestas*, the good of society, becomes the ultimate goal of his natural law doctrine.

Dissemination and Popularisation are the keywords which characterise the next section. It concerns everything on the subject of the mediation of texts and thoughts. Herbert Jaumann surveys French-Protestant journalism in the Holy Roman Empire, raising doubts as to whether this is the appropriate term to describe it. His example is Gabriel d'Artis. Orthodox, frank, and extreme at the same time, this former Berlin pastor and later journalist gave offences to all and sundry. Believing that Berlin was the centre of 'Socinianism', he moved to the United Provinces, to Sweden, and finally to London. On examination of d'Artis' *Journal de Hambourg* (1695/96), Herbert Jaumann places him within the German journalistic scene. Here, d'Artis collaborated with Leibniz in order to win Sophie, wife of Hannoveran elector Ernst August, for his project—but his efforts proved in vain. As a journalist, d'Artis' work is strongly reminiscent of Bayle and of the controversial Christian Thomasius, a prominent professor and political figure in Halle. Indeed, the *Journal de Hambourg* itself falls into the category of Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, of the *Nouveau Journal des Savants*, and of the *Bibliothèque germanique*. These journals could be considered as being more flexible, learned, and innovative in selecting, popularising, and disseminating matters of interest, in comparison to those of the Lutheran concurrence—except the *Monatsgespräche* by Thomasius which correspond the 'Baylian type'. This is why Jaumann concludes that 'Huguenot journalism' did not develop much beyond what was already in existence in the *res publica litteraria*. In this case of popularisation and dissemination, French-Protestant belief and thought seems to have had little influence.

Annett Volmer, however, is more optimistic as far as the influence of French-Protestant thought is concerned. She deals with the genre of library manuals, in the French context established by Gabriel Naudé and François de La Mothe le Vayer in the 17th century. But her example stems from a later date. Its history could be traced back to when Minister Ludwig Wilhelm Graf von Münchow personally

approached Jean Henri Samuel Formey, secretary of the Berlin academy, philosopher, and pastor, asking him to comprise a list of books which every private library should include. Formey did and the result was published in various editions. Annett Volmer compares these editions, and considers their content to be a canon of knowledge for the male and female citizen. In the theological, historical, and philosophical sections, this canon was still being influenced by French-Protestant belief, thought, and tradition. As for the other chapters, e.g. “Poésie”, Formey’s canon is still much closer to French than German literature. But that is not really surprising. As French citizens, the French Protestants were said to possess a beautiful and popular writing—a gift, which German authors like Christian Wolff used to their advantage. In Germany, even 50 years later, literary ideals of the French-Reformed were still being linked to the country from which they had fled.

When considering Joris van Eijnatten’s contribution, it seems as if all these perceptions could also be applied to the situation of the intellectual *Refuge* in the United Provinces. Even if the Dutch Republic was more restrictive towards the refugees, intellectual life developed in a comparable way. Joris van Eijnatten provides us with the keywords “outward orthodoxy”, “francophone social elitism”, and “domestic assimilation”. But it was not by mere accident that enlightened erudites like Barbeyrac and d’Artis left Teissier’s Berlin, eventually trying to find home in the United Provinces where the Arminian tradition was still present. In Amsterdam, Groningen, Leiden, Rotterdam etc., their activities were the same: they translated, reviewed, and popularised texts which they considered to be important for their philosophical, moral, theological, or aesthetical sketches.

Taking all of these accounts together, we find various answers to our thesis on the intellectual support which the *Refuge* provided for Berlin (and for other towns or regions). Most contributions confirm our thesis—but to different extents. Although all contributions deal with the intellectual performance of one or more French Protestants, each of these performances turns out to be more or less specific ‘French-Protestant’ and more or less needed or wanted in the Berlin *res publica litteraria*. One extreme is marked by those theologians or philosophers who—like d’Artis and Barbeyrac—turned out to be too controversial for the moderate atmosphere in the French-Protestant community itself. But thanks to his translation of Pufendorf Barbeyrac furthered German natural right thought substantially.

We shall conclude by classifying these different types of intellectual support the moderate as well as the orthodox and the ‘clandestine’ *Refuge* provided for Berlin and Brandenburg-Prussia:

- (1) *Symbolic support*. Political symbols (e.g. texts or paintings) helped to establish and to conserve the monarchy. Teissier for example, being appointed by the elector, contributed considerably to the court’s and the Calvinist’s panegyric.
- (2) *Practical support*. Intellectual life also included those who applied their knowledge to the practical disciplines: in medicine, jurisprudence, diplomacy, administration etc., the ‘public services’ of Berlin and Brandenburg-Prussia considerably improved with the support of the refugees, e.g. the *Charité* was founded by the French-Protestants.
- (3) *Material support*. Collecting manuscripts and texts was one form of material support, which was provided by the learned librarian Mathurin Veyssière de La Croze and advice about libraries was another (Formey). Certain types of translation also belong in this category because Latin texts translated into French made them more accessible to a wider public, e.g. to women.
- (4) *Aesthetic support* was a third, but very important form of material support. Since both French language and culture were held in high esteem for their aesthetical qualities, the role of French Protestants was very significant. They were said to have helped in cultivating the country and to have encouraged the people adopt the attitudes of the Court. In this context, translation was seen as a beautification of German or Latin texts.
- (5) *Mediating support*. Another effect the popular French language had at the end of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century was the internationalisation of German texts and literary tradition. Observing the huge amount of French-Protestant journals it is no wonder that they were more flexible, learned, innovative, witty, and better informed than the German equivalent. But—like the *Bibliothèque germanique*—they also distributed German literature and praised the moral consequences of the German Reformation. Even the orthodox became interested in German *Belles Lettres*, translating it for their own circles. Writing history was another tool for the purposes of mediation. With their immense church histories Beausobre and Lenfant were also interested in a common Protestant tradition.—A case, contradictory to unification

would be Philippe Naudé who defended his dogmatic belief, be that for good reasons.

- (6) *Moral or moral-theological support*. Other members of the Reformed church went further. Jean Pierre de Crousaz, a Swiss-Protestant, diplomat, mathematician, and professor of logic, promoted irenic projects. He attempted to unite the Protestant confessions against the sceptics and the Catholic church. But it is characteristic that he was not appointed by the elector of Brandenburg-Prussia but by the landgrave of Hesse-Kassel.

This incident again illustrates the difficulties which ‘support’ or the mere want for ‘support’ were faced with. ‘Support’ knew its limitations and its chances in an environment that was already formed and highly ‘cultivated’.

This volume is in part the result of an international conference on “The Berlin *Refuge* between 1680 and 1780. Moraltheological and Scholarly Knowledge in European Context” (“Der Berliner Refuge zwischen 1680 und 1780. Moraltheologisches und gelehrtes Wissen im europäischen Kontext”), sponsored by the German Science Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). It took place at the Humboldt-University Berlin (28 September–1 October 2000).<sup>3</sup> John Christian Laursen and Fabrizio Lomonaco did not attend the conference, but their contributions are designed to complement the volume. For the same reason Annett Volmer chose a new topic instead of continuing her paper on journalism in Berlin and elsewhere.

We owe a great debt of gratitude not only to them, but to many more people for suggestions, discussions, and ‘material help’. Among our colleagues, we must particularly thank Christine Haug, Hartmut Hecht, and Stefan Lorenz for their instructive papers, which—for several reasons—could not be published in this volume. Cornelia Buschmann, Sven Knebel, Winfried Schröder, and Simone Zurbuchen found time to participate in the conference; we would like to thank them for inspiring discussions. We also wish to thank Jörg Schönert, who encouraged us to plan the conference. For her help, patience, and support we owe a vote of thank to Bianca Unverhau. By great

---

<sup>3</sup> On the conference see Toni Bernhart’s report, in: *Zeitschrift für Germanistik* 2 (2001), pp. 415f.

good fortune, Kerstin Krull offered us her service as administrative secretary. We thank her for organising accommodation and staff.

Finally we would like to dedicate this volume to the late Conrad Grau, who was no longer able to participate in the conference. Without his contributions on the Berlin Academy and on the development of science in Brandenburg-Prussia,<sup>4</sup> it would have proved far more difficult for us to find out about the *Refuge*'s intellectual and institutional background.

---

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Conrad Grau: Hugenotten in der Wissenschaft Brandenburg-Preußens Ende des 17. und im 18. Jahrhundert, in: Zeitschrift für Geisteswissenschaft 34/6 (1986), pp. 508–522; C.H.: “Savans réfugiés—Französischreformierte Gelehrte”. Über den Beitrag der Hugenotten zur Wissenschaftsentwicklung in Brandenburg-Preußen am Ende des 17. und im 18. Jahrhundert, in: Hugenotten in Brandenburg-Preußen, ed. Ingrid Mittenzwei. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für Geschichte. Berlin 1987 (Studien zur Geschichte 8), pp. 230–278. To some extent, Grau's contributions stand ‘on the shoulders’ of Adolf von Harnack, who was one of the first to write a large volume to the history on the Berlin Academy.



I

INTRODUCTION

This page intentionally left blank

“GENTLE, REFINED, CULTIVATED, WITTY PEOPLE”:  
COMMENTS ON THE INTELLECTUAL HISTORY  
OF THE BERLIN *REFUGE* AND ON  
RELEVANT RESEARCH\*

Sandra Pott

“Gentle, refined, cultivated, witty people”—these were the words the young Frederick II used to describe the Berlin colonists.<sup>1</sup> The *dauphin* had to know. After all, he had grown up among *réfugiés*, or rather, he had been brought up by them.<sup>2</sup> But the future ruler of the ‘hereditary lands’ Prussia and Brandenburg was aware of the tragic reasons for his French-style education. The Bloody Wedding of Paris in 1572 and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 are dates which mark the sufferings of the Reformed in their country of origin. On 18 October 1685, Louis XIV not only banned their religion but also prohibited their quitting France on pain of the galleys.<sup>3</sup> When the Reformed tried to leave the country, the “gentle” representatives of French civilisation were threatened by merciless persecutions, known as the *dragonnades*.

On the one hand there were the good *réfugiés* and on the other hand the evil tyrant and his entourage. This black-and-white depiction of the *Refuge* was typical for Frederick and for the way in which the Reformed saw themselves, but also for relevant research.<sup>4</sup> It sounds like a classical theme for the opera, and in fact it was no problem at all to put it on stage in post-Revolution France. Giacomo Meyerbeer’s

---

\* Translated by Tobias Naber.

<sup>1</sup> Helene von Nostitz: Berlin—Erinnerung und Gegenwart. Leipzig, Berlin: Beyer 1938, p. 118.—I wish to thank Johannes Saltzwedel for this remark.

<sup>2</sup> Nostitz: Berlin (footnote 1).

<sup>3</sup> Johannes E. Bischoff [7 Karten v. Eberhard von Harsdorf]: Lexikon deutscher Hugenotten-Orte mit Literatur- und Quellen-Nachweisen für ihre evangelisch-reformierten Réfugiés-Gemeinden von Flamen, Franzosen, Waldensern und Wallonen. Bad Karlshafen: Verlag des Deutschen Hugenotten Vereins 1994 (Geschichtsblätter des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins. e.V. 22), p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Ingrid Brandenburg, Klaus Brandenburg: Hugenotten. Geschichte eines Martyriums. Leipzig: Edition Leipzig 1990.

opera *Les Huguenots*, staged in Paris in 1836, was a tremendous success.<sup>5</sup> It was a classic tear jerker: the Bloody Wedding of the King of Navarre, which was destined to end with the death of the two lovers. Operas need to be exaggerated like that. Sometimes historiography cannot do without one-sidedness. But the social history of the last thirty years has taught us about the ‘dark’ sides of the *Refuge*.<sup>6</sup> Today we know about elitist Calvinism of officials and court chaplains in Berlin and its outskirts, which has been described as a Calvinist-dominated “state churchdom”.<sup>7</sup> We also know about local patronages and the recruitment of Reformed scholars by the Brandenburg and Prussian dynasty.<sup>8</sup> But regardless of the facts about the flight—the internal and external depictions of the *réfugiés* were criticised. However, this criticism overshoots the mark when it describes the *Refuge*—ironically or not—as “a massive project of cultural imperialism”.<sup>9</sup>

By the way, on the subject of criticism, allow me a word of self-criticism. It is all too easy to pick out elements of one-sidedness in an article or treatise and criticise them, in order to surpass it with one’s own more or less original synthesis. Such a synthesis is usually born of another kind of one-sidedness, so I will spare you this.

---

<sup>5</sup> On “Les Huguenots”, which—ironically—became the prototype of the French opera; Michael Walter: *Hugenotten Studien*. Frankfurt/M. etc.: Lang 1987 (Europäische Hochschulschriften; Reihe 36, Musikwissenschaft 24).

<sup>6</sup> See Frédéric Hartweg, Stefi Jersch-Wenzel (eds.): *Die Hugenotten und das Refuge*. Deutschland und Europa. Berlin: 1990 (Einzeleröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin 74); the periodical “Hugenotten” (Deutschen Hugenotten-Gesellschaft): <http://www.Hugenotten.de>; for further information see <http://www.jalb.de> an <http://www.reformiert-online.de>.

<sup>7</sup> Rudolf von Thadden: *Die Brandenburgisch-Preussischen Hofprediger im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der absolutistischen Staatsgesellschaft in Brandenburg-Preussen. Berlin: de Gruyter 1959 (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 32); Peter-Michael Hahn: *Calvinismus und Staatsbildung*. Brandenburg-Preußen im 17. Jahrhundert, in: *Territorialstaat und Calvinismus*, ed. Meinrad Schaab. Stuttgart 1993 (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg; Reihe B: Forschungen 127), pp. 239–269; Sieglinde C. Othmer: *Berlin und die Verbreitung des Naturrechts in Europa*. Kultur- und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zu Jean Barbeyracs Pufendorf-Übersetzungen und eine Analyse seiner Leserschaft. Berlin 1970 (Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin 30).

<sup>8</sup> See Monique Dannhauser: *De la France à l’Allemagne*. Les Huguenots Français et l’un de leurs descendants, Jacques-Egide Duhan de Jandun, précepteur du roi de Prusse Frédéric II. Egelsbach 1999 (Deutsche Hochschulschriften 1169).

<sup>9</sup> With a subtle interpretation on this difficult point John Christian Laursen: Introduction, in: *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. J. C. L. Leiden etc.: Brill 1995 (Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 60), pp. 1–14, p. 6.

To start with the most important point, I would rather agree with most of the aspects of the statement I mentioned first, even if they may sound exaggerated. In the following systematic historical comments I will even attempt to substantiate the self-image of the Huguenot refugees and their quite selfish ‘patrons’.

To achieve this, I will elucidate what you are going to learn from the following contributions in much more detail, that is, the scholarly correspondence among the mentioned elites and the emergence of certain literary genres. By referring back to the history of the research on and the impacts of the *Refuge*, we can see that although the assessment of these phenomena may well be regarded as one-sided, it should not be shrugged off as naive.

### 1. *Stories of Fall and Rise. What is the Refuge?*

*Deformation* and *Reformation*—both were and still are constitutive elements of Protestantism.<sup>10</sup> Attempting to dissociate from the supposedly one and only Catholic ‘*vera ecclesia*’ made it necessary to pillory its decline, the abuse of official positions, papism in general, celibacy, ‘pagan’ symbol worship, and the persecution of so-called heretics,<sup>11</sup> in order to praise the Protestant reform as a return to true Christianity. Both aspects are reflected in the different types and heterogeneous versions of Church historiography saturated with incidents, full of myths and abundant in textual criticism. This is a common knowledge and much research has been done in this field—which is especially true for the scholarly *Refuge*.

Models of fall and rise have established, stabilised and preserved the identity of the Huguenot refugees in terms of their beliefs, their origins and their lives in the countries of the *Refuge*. When it comes to the degeneration of Catholicism, one is most often told that it

---

<sup>10</sup> See Erich Seeberg: Einleitung, in: E. S.: Gottfried Arnold. In Auswahl herausgegeben. München: A. Langen, G. Müller 1934, pp. 1–23; Christoph Marksches: Die eine Reformation und die vielen Reformen oder Braucht evangelische Kirchengeschichtsschreibung Dekadenmodelle? In: Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 106/1 (1995), pp. 70–97.—I wish to thank Roland Kany for this remark.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. the so-called “*Livre des martyrs*” by Ioannes Crispinus [Jean Crespin]: *Actiones et Monumenta Martyrum, quia Wicleffo et Hvssio ad nostram hanc aetatem in Germania, Gallia, Anglia, Flandria, Italia, & ipsa demum Hispania, veritatem Evangelicam sanguine suo constanter obsignerunt*. S.l. 1560.

occurs whenever the Catholic church persecutes ‘heretics’.<sup>12</sup> The ‘intellectual’ blame was laid on the Church Fathers’ standardising an ‘authentic’ interpretation of the Bible. This interpretation—which had been commonplace for Protestants for a long time in the early 18th century—was rejected,<sup>13</sup> but for lack of other records, the Fathers’ treatises tended to be used as a reference for the history of the rise of their own church,<sup>14</sup> which in turn came into being in early Christianity with the Valentinians, Manichaeans, and Nestorians.<sup>15</sup> Its existence continued in the pre-Reformation movements of the Waldenses, Albigenses and Wycliffites (the later Hussites) and the Bohemian Brethren. Jacques Lefèvre, Ulrich Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger, and primarily Jean Calvin, were held in high esteem by the Reformed, but significantly less Martin Luther and Martin Bucer. Where was the link between the teachings of these ‘precursors’ and those of the *Refuge*?

(1) First of all, it was the simple, tolerant and poor Christianity in Paulinic tradition: the denial of the outward cult of the church and of the Catholic stance that the church was called to mediate the Salvation. The rejection of this stance was accompanied with the conviction of being assigned to an anti-Catholic and rather Bible-oriented posture and the denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation, (and the denial of the Lutheran Real Presence of Christ in the sacraments). But the simple Christianity had been controversial even in

---

<sup>12</sup> Martin Mulsow: *Gegen die Fälschung der Vergangenheit. Philologie bei Mathurin Veyssièrre La Croze*, in: *Philologie und Erkenntnis. Beiträge zu Begriff und Problem frühneuzeitlicher ‘Philologie’*, ed. Ralph Häfner. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2001 (Frühe Neuzeit 61), pp. 333–348; Mulsow: *Die drei Ringe. Toleranz und clandestine Gelehrsamkeit bei Mathurin Veyssièrre La Croze (1661–1739)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2001 (Hallesche Beiträge zur Europäischen Aufklärung 16).

<sup>13</sup> Joris van Eijnatten: *Mutua Christianorum Tolerantia. Irenicism and Toleration in the Netherlands: The Stinstra Affair 1740–1745*. Florence: Olschki 1998 (Studi e Testi per la Storia della Tolleranza in Europa nei secoli XVI–XVIII 2), pp. 47–51; Sandra Pott: *Reformierte Morallehren und deutsche Literatur von Jean Barbeyrac bis Christoph Martin Wieland*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2002 (Frühe Neuzeit 75), chap. II.

<sup>14</sup> Sandra Pott: “*Critica perennis*”. Zur Gattungsspezifität gelehrter Kommunikation im Umfeld der “*Bibliothèque Germanique*”, in: *Die Praktiken der Gelehrsamkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit*, eds. Helmut Zedelmaier, Martin Mulsow. Tübingen 2001 (Frühe Neuzeit 64), pp. 251–273.

<sup>15</sup> Ralph Häfner: *Die Fässer der Zeus. Ein homerisches Mythologem und seine Aufnahme in die Manichäismusdebatte in Deutschland am Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Scientia Poetica* 1 (1997), pp. 35–63; see John Christian Laursen in this volume.

the 18th century. Within the *Refuge*, orthodox and ‘papist’ groups, which by then had been in existence for a long time, were opposed by other (or ‘poorer’) groups.<sup>16</sup> The fact that scholars and humanists ruled out hierarchic structures that existed in the Catholic ‘world church’ could not be found in contemporary reality.

(2) Secondly, the *principle of sola scriptura*, which in fact legitimised ‘simple Christianity’. In its purpose of criticising the church, however, this was unique to the times of pre-Reformation and Reformation, since it had been determined earlier by nominalism. In the *Refuge* it was interpreted differently.

(3) Thirdly, the *predestination doctrine* in its complex and often diversified determination. A consensus on how the believer could attain God’s mercy could not be reached in the Berlin *Refuge* either.

So the birth of the *Refuge* was not only marked by polemical dissociation from the Catholic Church. The history of the *Refuge* saw considerable changes in—and partly even a renunciation of—its own doctrine and the implementation thereof. Considering that this issue only has subtle differences, is it then possible at all to speak of a *Refuge* that—as the title of the book suggests—developed “in the European context”? Let us return to what we said in the beginning. Stories of fall and rise have always been—and still are—an essential prerequisite of Protestant beliefs. So a dualism was inherent to this belief which needed a regular corroboration in order to renew the commemoration of the Reformation and its goals in the sense of a ‘permanent Reformation’. Good and evil were to be clearly separated. All things that went wrong could be identified and remedied by means of this black-and-white-scheme. But, in spite of the *Refuge* asseverating unity, this dualistic Protestant hypothesis of Deformation and Reformation seems to have incentivised further controversies and eventually segregations within the religious community.

The book is supposed to disclose the diversity of the *Refuge*. What I would like to give you first, however, is a catchy expression of what could be seen as the “Berlin *Refuge* in the European Context”

---

<sup>16</sup> For Western-Switzerland Maria-Cristina Pitassi: *De L’Orthodoxie aux Lumières. Genève 1670–1737*. Genève 1992 (*Histoire et Société* 24), pp. 11–20.

in the time between 1680 and 1780.<sup>17</sup> (1) Firstly, the *Refuge* was made up of denominational refugees of different generations; (2) secondly, those refugees made connections between their beliefs and the elements mentioned earlier; (3) and thirdly, most of the refugees could be called Huguenots (in the narrow sense, these were French-Reformed believers, in the broader sense, they were groups of other denominations of Reformed confession—as for Berlin, it was Waldenses, or French Swiss from Vaud as well as from the cantons of Geneva and Neuchâtel);<sup>18</sup> they were and still are all founded on the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563; (4) fourthly, and last, the Berlin Huguenot refugees stood out due to their “‘hybrid’ identity”, the mixture of imported philosophies, traditions and self-images with the cultural peculiarities characterised by their host countries, by the Holy Roman Empire, Switzerland, the Netherlands and so on.<sup>19</sup>

The Huguenot refugees’ view on this situation, was—according to an anonymous etching from 1740—expressed by Psalm 117:<sup>20</sup>

Oh, praise the Lord, all you peoples!  
 Laud Him, all you nations!  
 For His merciful kindness is great toward us,  
 And the truth of the Lord endures forever.  
 Praise the Lord!

Fifty-five years after the Revocation, the unifying power of Christian faith was still being emphasised. It allowed the ‘peoples’ to come

---

<sup>17</sup> See “Réfugiés”, in: Zedler, Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon [. . .]. Leipzig u. Halle 1741, column 1697: “[. . .] also nennet man anietzo in besonderm Verstande die Reformirten Frantzosen, welche der Religion wegen aus Frankreich entweder öffentlich vertrieben, oder heimlich entwichen sind, und sich in grosser Anzahl in den Chur-Brandenburgischen Landen niedergelassen haben.”

<sup>18</sup> I follow Bischoff: Lexikon (footnote 3), p. 145f.; on the different communities Ed[uard] Muret: Geschichte der französischen Kolonie in Brandenburg-Preußen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Berliner Gemeinde. Aus Veranlassung der Zweihundertjährigen Jubelfeier am 29. Oktober 1885 im Auftrage des Konsistoriums der Französischen Kirche zu Berlin und unter Mitwirkung des hierzu berufenen Komitees auf Grund amtlicher Quellen bearbeitet. Berlin: 1885; on the institutions Ursula Fuhrich-Grubert: Die Französische Kirche zu Berlin 1672–1945. Bad Karlshafen: Verlag des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins e.V. 1992 (Tagungsschriften des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins e.V. 11).

<sup>19</sup> See Katharina Middell: Hugenotten in Leipzig—Etappen der Konstruktion einer ‘hybriden’ Identität, in: Réfugiés und Emigrés. Migration zwischen Frankreich und Deutschland im 18. Jahrhunderts, eds. Thomas Höpel, K. M. Leipzig 1997 (Comparativ 7, 5/6), pp. 56–75.

<sup>20</sup> Printed in Margarete Welge: Die Französische Kirche zu Berlin, in: Hugenotten in Berlin, ed. Gottfried Bregulla. Berlin: Union Verlag 1988, pp. 88–132, p. 129.



into contact. Based on brotherly love, it did away with the particular interests of the nations. This is true at least in the *réfugiés*' utopian dreams which focused on the religious asylum which the Huguenot refugees had received thanks to brotherly love.<sup>21</sup> This is exactly the interrelation Charles Ancillon describes in his *Geschichte der Niederlassung der Réfugiés in den Staaten seiner Kurfürstlichen Hoheit von Brandenburg (1690)* [*History of the Settlements of the Réfugiés in the States of His Electoral Highness of Brandenburg (1690)*]. He praised the Edict of Potsdam, which had fostered the settlement of the Huguenots, as a “New Gospel”, as brotherly love put into practise.<sup>22</sup> But not only did the precept of brotherly love become the most important value of simple Christianity. It also became a unifying argumentative pattern of those *réfugiés* who did not only want to express their thanks for having been granted asylum in the years following 1685, but who also strove for a union of all Protestant Churches.<sup>23</sup> This shows that the *Refuge* was not a monolithic whole. Instead it can be considered as a network of brethren and sisters in faith with many branches. Just because of internal reasons, it mingled—and this is my first hypothesis—with other religions and cultures, on the grounds of its tolerant openness to other confessions.

## 2. *Unionism. Scholarly correspondence*

The names Georg Calixt and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz were often associated with irenic tendencies in the German territories. From the early 18th century to the 1840s, Reformed scholars also endeavoured to bring about an understanding between the Protestant Churches in Central Europe. They were fighting on two fronts: against the papists among the Catholics as well as among the Protestants and against the *libertins*, the sceptics and materialists impressed by the

---

<sup>21</sup> The picture is part of the French-Protestant's utopias; see Frank Lestringant: *Huguenots en Utopie, ou le Genre utopique et la Réforme (XVI<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, in: *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme française* 146 (2000), pp. 253–306.—For this remark I wish to thank Roland Kany.

<sup>22</sup> Charles Ancillon: *Geschichte der Niederlassung der Réfugiés in den Staaten Seiner Kurfürstlichen Hoheit von Brandenburg. Nach der französischen Originalausgabe vom Jahre 1690.* Berlin 1939 (*Geschichtsblätter des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins* XV. Zehnt H. 8), pp. 17–20.

<sup>23</sup> See Pott: *Reformierte Morallehren* (footnote 13).

French philosophy. Those infecting the scholars of all lands with the libertine, the ‘dangerous’ philosophy, or with Pyrrhonism, could be found at the Sanssouci court, where Voltaire and Julien Offray de La Mettrie enjoyed being in the ruler’s favour. But they could also be found in Switzerland. The Genevan Jean-Jacques Rousseau was blamed for his blatant ‘sceptomania’ which threatened the ‘true faith’.

But where in Berlin were the 18th-century Catholic papists? Even today taking a stroll across the Gendarmenmarkt will help us to find them. One name is chiselled into the walls of St Hedwig Cathedral, built in 1747 by Frederick II, not far from the Reformed church: Angelus Maria Quirini (1680–1755), Prefect of the Vatican Library (1730) and of the Index Congregation (1740), Cardinal, Bishop of Brescia, Defender of the crypto-Protestants and the representatives of the “Catholic enlightenment”.<sup>24</sup> His Eminence was not only in contact with Pierre Jurieu and later on with Voltaire, but he was also a member of the Académie française (1743), the Göttingen and the Berlin Academy. It was the basically irenically-minded Quirini,<sup>25</sup> who, in a dedication to the Berlin Academy from 1748, provoked<sup>26</sup> its secretary Jean Henri Samuel Formey (1711–1797) to write a treatise against him.<sup>27</sup> He did this because the Cardinal elevated the “Catholic enlightenment”, the erudition of Contarini, Pole and Sadolet concerning the translation of the Holy Bible, above Luther’s findings.<sup>28</sup> His Reformed opponent however, defended the Father of the other Protestant Church against the followers of Rome! And he did not

---

<sup>24</sup> Giuseppe Alberigo: Quirini, Angelo Maria, in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, eds. Walter Kasper with Konrad Baumgartner, Horst Bürkle, Klaus Ganzer, Karl Kertelge, Wilhelm Korff, Peter Walter. Vol. 8. Freiburg et al.: Herder 1999, col. 775f.

<sup>25</sup> Friedrich Lauchert: Die irenischen Bestrebungen des Kardinal Angelus Maria Quirini (OSB) speziell in seinem Verkehr mit deutschen protestantischen Gelehrten, in: *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benedictinerordens und seiner Zweige* 24 (1903), pp. 243–275; Alberigo: Quirini.

<sup>26</sup> Über Formey und sein Wirken an der Akademie Werner Krauss: Ein Akademiesekretär vor 200 Jahren: Samuel Formey, in: W. K., *Studien zur deutschen und französischen Aufklärung*. Berlin 1963, pp. 53–62.

<sup>27</sup> Sendschreiben des Herrn Samuel Formey, [. . .] an S. Eminenz, den Hochwürdigen Herrn, Herrn Angelus Maria Quirini, [. . .] in welchem erwiesen wird, daß D. Luther gelehrter und tugendhafter und folglich zur Besserung der Kirche tüchtiger gewesen sei, als die Cardinäle seiner Zeit, mit einem Vorberichte des Herrn Prof. Formey, als einer Einleitung und neuen Zugabe in dieser Streitigkeit, auf Verlangen ins Teutsche übersezt von Johann Jakob Wippel, [. . .]. Berlin 1749.

<sup>28</sup> Sendschreiben, [\*](3v).

hesitate to refer to the scholarly past of such replies. Quirin’s attack was put on a level with Pierre Nicole’s polemic against the Calvinists.<sup>29</sup> However, Formey could credit himself with a great number of defences—that of Jean Claude,<sup>30</sup> not particularly that of Pierre Bayle, but that of Jurieu,<sup>31</sup> but above all that of Claude Pajon.<sup>32</sup> The patterns of polemic theology still had an effect in the enlightened theology—but they were principally used against the papists in their own camp.

The papists, in turn, followed the same patterns of scepticism and intolerance which they had been accusing their confessional opponents of. Accusing others of papism was an easy thing, however. Isaac de Beausobre (1659–1738), a smart Berlin theologian, teacher of later generations of theologians and father of a numerous progeny, was a borderline case. He endeavoured to prove alleged heresies wrong, but he gave priority to his own interests in the Reformed history and in the Reformed Church: communicating with ‘heretics’ of his own camp was no more difficult for him than communicating with followers from other churches. It was characteristic that it was not so much the theologians who were eager to even out differences, as the philosophers and jurists, such as the *réfugié* Jean Barbeyrac (1674–1744), who was charged with Socinianism (among others by Beausobre), or the Swiss mathematician, philosopher and diplomat Jean Pierre de Crousaz (1663–1750).<sup>33</sup>

With regard to Leibniz’s commitment to the foundation of the Academy, Adolf von Harnack showed in his *Geschichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1900)* [*History of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences (1900)*] that the prerequisites for such efforts were created by scholarly knowledge, by the joint and enlightened striving for reason, cognition and understanding. A look into the numerous

---

<sup>29</sup> It is Pierre Nicole: *Préjugés légitimes contre les calvinistes*. Paris 1671; P. N.: *Les prétendus reformez convaincus de Schisme*. Paris 1684; on the Nicole-reception Antony McKenna: *Quelques indices sur la réception des œuvres de Pierre Nicole*, in: *Pierre Nicole (1625–1695)*. Paris: Mazarine 1995 (*Chroniques de Port-Royal* 45), pp. 259–276.

<sup>30</sup> [Jean Claude:] *La défense de la réformation contre le livre intitulé Préjugés légitimes contre les Calvinistes*. S.l. 1673.

<sup>31</sup> Pierre Jurieu: *Préjugés légitimes contre le Papisme*. Amsterdam 1685.

<sup>32</sup> Claude Pajon: *Examen du livre, qui porte pour titre [...] Préjugés légitimes contre les Calvinistes*. En 3 parties. Bionne 1673.

<sup>33</sup> On Crousaz Pott: *Reformierte Morallehren* (footnote 13).

journals of the *Refuge* shows how the Reformed editors considered the changes in scholarly knowledge to be worth reporting about—more or less from the Unionist point of view: towards the end of the confessional age coalitions were formed with enlightened Lutheran theologians and scholars such as Johann Albert Fabricius and Johann Lorenz Mosheim. The fading of great polemics in the past century gave way to an emphasis on moral theology, natural law and church law.<sup>34</sup>

By the middle of the 18th century this situation changed—partly because Frederick II assumed power in 1740. The new ruler had great plans for the Academy. He wanted to make it a centre of applied natural sciences.<sup>35</sup> Allow me to tell you the story of a family to illustrate how that plan was implemented: the story of the Beausobre family. While “le grand Beausobre”, the theologian Isaac de Beausobre, whom I mentioned earlier, was still preoccupied with an annotated Bible and a historical and critical history of heresies, his descendant Louis de Beausobre (1730–1783) dedicated himself to natural sciences, to post mortem examinations as they were executed in the anatomic theatre.<sup>36</sup> In his *Pyrrhonisme du sage/Le pyrrhonisme raisonnable* (1754/1755) he wrote about the problematic ‘empiric’ interests of an almost secular anti-metaphysical science.<sup>37</sup> Yet he and Johann Heinrich Lambert, Johann Georg Sulzer and Johann Bernhard Merian committed themselves to continuing the controversial anatomic experiments of the physician Johann Friedrich Meckel. As the king had

---

<sup>34</sup> Simone Zurbuchen: *Naturrecht und natürliche Religion. Zur Geschichte des Toleranzproblems von Samuel Pufendorf bis Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann 1991 (Epistemata. Würzburger wissenschaftliche Schriften: Reihe Philosophie 82–1990).

<sup>35</sup> See Eduard Winter: *Einleitung*, in: *Die Registres der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften 1746–1766. Dokumente für das Wirken Leonhard Eulers in Berlin*. Zum 250. Geburtstag hg. i. Verbindung m. Maria Winter u. eingel. v. Eduard Winter. Berlin: 1957, pp. 1–91, p. 16–21.

<sup>36</sup> On medical practice in the *Refuge* Jürgen Wilke: *Ärzte und Apotheker*, in: *Hugenotten in Berlin*, ed. Bregulla (footnote 20), pp. 298–310.

<sup>37</sup> He discusses this subject with Formey: L[ouis] de Beausobre to Jean Henri Samuel Formey, Francfort sur l’Oder, 30. Octobre 1749, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin; Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 2 a 1759 (2), Louis de Beausobre, [8, 9]: “Croiriez vous, Monsieur, qu’il se peut trouver ici d’autres bons freres qui déclament contre la Metaphysique? [R]ien pourtant de plus vrai; et qui plus est ce sont Messieurs Docteurs en Medecine, et leurs disciples, eux qui en auroient après les Theologiens la plus de besoin. Cependant animés d’un paroxisme hors de lieu ils ne montent sur la chaire, que pour porter des coups à cette sublime science; vous pouvez bien penser, Monsieur, que ce ne’est qu’à leur honte. J’ai été présent à une de ces déclamations, j’ai été du jeu, mais par bonheur les rieurs ont été pour moi.”

prohibited anatomic experiments with carcasses by *ordre*, Beausobre, Lambert, Sulzer and Merian held the opinion that this was a “dangerous setback” (“rechute dangereuse”).<sup>38</sup>

The story of the Formey family looks quite similar. Johann Ludwig Formey (1766–1823), the son of Jean Henri Samuel Formey, the secretary of the Academy, also dedicated himself to the art which had always been practised so brilliantly by the *réfugiés*: medicine.<sup>39</sup> In his *Versuch einer medicinischen Topographie von Berlin (1796)* [*Attempt on a Medical Topography of Berlin (1796)*], he provides both a review on the state of health of the Berliners, and the demographic development of the city following the Thirty Years’ War. And he soberly asserts:

Both the Reformation introduced by Joachim II in 1536 and the absorption of the French *réfugiés*, the refugees from the Palatinate and the Moravian Brethren significantly contributed to this extraordinary growth [. . .].<sup>40</sup>

Was the *Refuge* a reasonable means to increasing the population of the state? Instead of attempting to answer this complex question,<sup>41</sup> I will deduce a second hypothesis from what has already been said. Scholarly knowledge was above all a way of defining a new position and of preserving their own traditions whilst in exile, but it also formed the basis for forming coalitions and paved the way for the *réfugiés*’ assimilation into the society of Berlin of that time.

### 3. *Literary Forms*

The fact that you can describe very similar patterns and comparable processes of change for the literary form does not really come as a surprise. In the beginning of the *Refuge*, the moral theological treatises of the preachers Jacques Abbadie and Jean La Placette, the comments on natural law by Barbeyrac, and the text-critical works of Beausobre and Lenfant dominated. On the other hand, the interest

---

<sup>38</sup> HA Geheimes Zivilkabinett, Rep. 96, Nr. 434 A, [21]. Geheimes Staatsarchiv; Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

<sup>39</sup> Wilke: *Ärzte und Apotheker* (footnote 36).

<sup>40</sup> D. [Johann] Ludwig Formey: *Versuch einer medicinischen Topographie von Berlin*. Berlin 1796, p. 5.

<sup>41</sup> See also the review on Johann Gottfried Meiern’s “Acta Pacis Westphalicae”: *Bibliothèque Germanique* 41 (1738), pp. 1–10.

for aesthetics and the ‘belles lettres’ prevailed from the forties onwards. This was the logical consequence of those discussions on the rampant Pyrrhonism. The ‘sceptics’ referred to something unclear, something difficult to define; in a word: they referred to everything concerning questions of taste and experience.<sup>42</sup> And there was almost nothing that was considered so difficult to determine as the idea of ‘the beautiful’. Accordingly, it was essential to limit the vagueness in the field of aesthetics. This was to be accomplished with the help of rules that were independent from the mere sense of ‘the beautiful’ and which everybody could approve of.<sup>43</sup>

There was one characteristic that was attributed to the Huguenot refugees right from the beginning, and they were well aware of this: the mere usage of the French language seemed to grant privileges to the Reformed scholars. They used an elegant and easy-to-comprehend language, that is, they expressed themselves the ‘French way’. This was at least the judging of the German scholars, which they used either for or against the writings of the Reformed. But what are the actual innovations of the *réfugiés* for German literature?

(1) Firstly, the transfer of French writings to Germany, in the literal sense. The *réfugiés* themselves sold French writings (sometimes in spite of impending censorship) or they re-edited them with critical annotations to adopt them to the ideas of morality at that time.

(2) Secondly, they also contributed to the development of these ideas on morality, which in the beginning were still marked by religious conflicts. As an example I would like to refer to *Philosophe Chrétien* (1750) [*The Christian Philosopher* (1750)] by Formey. Not only did the German translator of this text, Osterländer,<sup>44</sup> welcome the success of this work with scholars of different confessions, but he also mentioned a textual deviation, a favour granted to a ‘friend in faith’: while Formey referred to his ‘friend’ Calvin, Osterländer replaced

---

<sup>42</sup> [Jean Henri Samuel Formey:] Discours préliminaire de l’éditeur, in: *Essai sur le Beau par le père André J. avec un discours préliminaire, et des réflexions sur le goût*. Par Mr. Formey. Amsterdam 1759, pp. I–CXXX, p. X: “[...] de toutes ces inéquivalences, de toutes ces extravagances, qui font quelquefois douter de l’utilité de la Raison, & même de son existence. Le Pyrrhonisme dérive immédiatement delà.”

<sup>43</sup> [Formey:] Discours préliminaire, p. XVIII<sup>f</sup>.—referring to Jean-Pierre de Crousaz: *Traité du Beau*. Amsterdam 1715.

<sup>44</sup> Osterländer is not listed in any of the bio-bibliographical references available.

this part of the text by the ideas of his own ‘friend’ Luther and apologised to the author for this.<sup>45</sup> The fear of God, faith and beliefs were not only central topics in *The Christian Philosopher*,<sup>46</sup> but also in *Moral Speeches as a Sequel of the Christian Philosopher* (1764).<sup>47</sup> In the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* [*Universal German Library*] from the year 1766, Moses Mendelssohn therefore praised the highly regarded author for his ‘moral preaching’:

The eternity of the agonies of hell have apparently never been demonstrated as clearly as by Mr F(ormey). The treatise on the necessity to submit moral philosophy to faith (as its original source), is formulated very well indeed.<sup>48</sup>

Mendelssohn’s appreciation of the *Moral Speeches* is an example for more tolerant ideas which came about in 18th century moral thinking. They rejected the confessional tendencies of morality. Formey himself endorsed this argumentation. Furthermore he derived his moral teachings—referring to Pliny—from nature as early as 1759.<sup>49</sup>

(3) Thirdly, the journals of the *Refuge* had an influence on something that was still in its infancy in Prussia:<sup>50</sup> a culture of reviewing literature

---

<sup>45</sup> Osterländer to Formey. Frankfurt/M. 28.10.1753, Nachlaß Formey K. 29, 1 letter, 2 leaves, 2. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz: “C’est que je me suis emancipé de faire Casum pro Amico dans ma Traduction, y aiant assigné la place à mon Ami Luther que Vous avez donné à vôtre Ami Calvin [dans le Disc. XVIII. Tom. 11]. Comme je porte une veritable Estime pour ces deux Grands Hommes dont l’un & l’autre, selon moi, merite la plus glorieuse memoire, j’ai cru d’être juste à la conserver dans la Copie pour l’un, que Vous avez fait pour l’autre.”

<sup>46</sup> “Vorbereitungs-Abhandlung, von der wahren Gottesfurcht”, in: Der christliche Philosoph, aus dem Französischen des berühmten Herrn Professors Formey, [. . .] ins Deutsche übersetzt. [. . .] Vol. 1–3. Franckfurt, Leipzig 1753, vol. 1, pp. 1–20.

<sup>47</sup> Herrn Professors Formey, [. . .] Moralische Reden als eine Fortsetzung des Christlichen Philosophen. Franckfurt, Leipzig 1765. Formey found a new translator: Johann Georg Krünitz (1728–1796), an unsuccessful medical doctor, but hard-working scholar. On Krünitz Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. Bd. 17. Berlin 1969 [Reprint of the first Edition 1883], p. 253.

<sup>48</sup> Moses Mendelssohn [Rev., in: Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek II/2 (1766), pp. 241f.], in: Rezensionenartikel in Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek (1765–1784). Literarische Fragmente. Bearb. v. Eva Engel. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Olms 1991 (Moses Mendelssohn, Gesammelte Schriften; Jubiläumsausgabe 5,2), p. 30.—Mendelssohn also discussed Prémontval and Bitaubé.

<sup>49</sup> Jean Henri Samuel Formey: Le Philosophe Payen, ou Pensées de Pline, avec un Commentaire Littéraire & Moral [. . .]. Leyde 1759/Der heydnische Philosoph, oder Gedanken des Plinius, mit gelehrten und moralischen Betrachtungen. [. . .] Vol. 1–3. Frankfurt, Leipzig 1761; see Formey’s on review in: Nouvelle Bibliothèque Germanique 25/2 (1760), pp. 288–301.

<sup>50</sup> Anne Goldgar: Impolite learning. Conduct and community in the Republic of Letters 1680–1750. New Haven, London: Yale University Press 1995.

in the native language.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, the *réfugiés* took little notice of what had already been published in German. This can be seen in the obituary of the pietist August Hermann Francke. The journalists of the *Bibliothèque Germanique* were very appreciative of his commitment to social questions and of his founding of the orphanage in Halle.<sup>52</sup> They even admitted that his German writings were quite popular in Germany, but they discovered that they were of no interest to ‘the foreigners’ (*les Etrangers*).<sup>53</sup> They also knew of the *Acta Eruditorum* and were appreciative of its publisher, Otto Mencke, for his erudition,<sup>54</sup> but they preferred consulting the journals of Bayle, Jean Le Clerc and the *Bibliothèque Angloise*. In spite of, or maybe just based on the fact that the *réfugiés* had their own essayistic tradition, they were emulated by Johann Christoph Gottsched and Friedrich Nicolai. Even in 1781, the posthumously published *Lexicon Aegyptiaco-Latinum* (1775) by Mathurin Veyssière de La Croze was very highly acclaimed in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*.<sup>55</sup>

(4) Fourthly, the refugees promoted the advent of ‘popular’ writings in general. In long and enthusiastic commentaries, the theories on natural law by Hugo Grotius and Samuel Pufendorf were updated. Therefore it was of importance not only for the self-justifying means of the *réfugiés*, but also—as a side effect—as an aid for the contemporary teaching programme at German universities.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Klaus Garber: Zentraleuropäischer Calvinismus und deutsche “Barock”-Literatur. Zu den konfessionspolitischen Ursprüngen der deutschen Nationalliteratur, in: Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland—Das Problem der “Zweiten Reformation”. Wissenschaftliches Symposium des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 1985, ed. Heinz Schilling. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann 1986 (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 195), pp. 317–348, p. 341.

<sup>52</sup> *Memoire sur la Vie du feu Mr. Francke*, in: *Bibliothèque Germanique* 18 (1729), pp. 123–139, p. 132–134.

<sup>53</sup> *Memoire sur la Vie du feu Mr. Francke*, p. 139.

<sup>54</sup> [...] *Qui comprend divers Ouvrages publiez par Mr. Frid. Otton Mencke*, in: *Bibliothèque Germanique, ou Histoire litteraire de l’Allemagne, de la Suisse, et des Pays du Nord* 32 (1735), pp. 126–128; on Mencke Augustinus Hubertus Laeven: *De “Acta Eruditorum” onder Redactie van Otto Mencke. De Geschiedenis van een internationaal Geleerdenperiodiek tussen 1682 en 1707*. Proefschrift [...] Amsterdam, Maarssen 1986.

<sup>55</sup> *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* 45/2 (1781), pp. 352–356.

<sup>56</sup> Othmer: *Berlin und die Verbreitung des Naturrechts* (footnote 7); *Zurbuchen: Naturrecht und natürliche Religion* (footnote 34).



(5) Fifthly, they enlivened the literary landscape in the middle of the 18th century by their (sometimes just for strategic reasons) commitment to aletophily, Christian Wolff’s ideas on wisdom, and its followers.<sup>57</sup> But this commitment had a *fundamentum in re*, that is striving for perfection as described by Wolff has to be able to be adapted to the individualistic ethics of Calvinism.

Considering all those astonishing achievements of the *réfugiés* in the field of literary production, it does not come as a surprise that at least one French-Reformed journal crept its way into the libraries of many universally erudite 18th-century ‘intellects’. The editors were so zealous that they were in correspondence with anybody of importance in scholarly Germany. Gottsched, who conducted correspondence with Jean Henri Samuel Formey and with Paul Emile de Mauclerc, one of the most vivid journalists of the *Refuge*, was and just one of the uncountable communicators. Their knowledge about German literature was accordingly profound. Again it is useful to take a look at the Beausobre family. Being the main publisher of the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, Isaac de Beausobre was still eager to learn everything about the antique and early Christian testimonies of Western culture, whereas Louis de Beausobre, the editor of the follow-up institution *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Germanique*, devoted himself merely to the writings of Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten and the ‘belles lettres’ starting with Gottsched up to Friedrich von Hagedorn, Karl Wilhelm Ramler and Johann Peter Uz.<sup>58</sup> This, of course, did not exclude questions on religion and faith.

Taking this into consideration, it is not surprising that the fate of the French-Reformed was commemorated in German literature. In his tragic play *Die Parisische Bluthochzeit König Heinrichs von Navarra (1745)* [*Blood Marriage of King Henri of Navarre in Paris (1745)*], Gottsched pilloried the machinations of the House of Guise and Queen Catherine de’ Medici, whom they believed to be hostile towards the Reformation.

---

<sup>57</sup> See the contributions by Detlef Döring and Stefan Lorenz in: *Gelehrte Gesellschaften im mitteldeutschen Raum (1650–1820)*, eds. Detlef Döring, Kurt Nowak. Stuttgart, Leipzig: S. Hirzel 2000 (Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse 76/2).

<sup>58</sup> Beausobre and Formey discussed what might be worth reading; see L[ouis] de Beausobre an Jean Henri Samuel Formey, Francfort sur l’Oder, 20. Juni 1750, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków.

A gentle, but rather poor statesman and a friend of the Protestants, Charles IX,<sup>59</sup> was portrayed as a victim of their intrigues just like Henry IV and his followers. The way the argument that only one *'vera ecclesia'* could exist was made part of the wheelings and dealings at court and the way it was turned against the unpopular 'heretics', who turned out to be steadfast, virtuous and truly faithful—all this was shown in Gottsched's comparatively factual and impressive records. Reason, understanding, moral feeling and prudence were united exemplarily in the person of Queen Margaret, who was married to Henry IV to make a reconciliation between Protestants and Catholics seemingly possible. His being a virtuous role-model made it possible for Margaret to reject the 'child-like faith' in Rome and in her mother Catherine's rule.<sup>60</sup>

To sum up the complex of the 'belles lettres', let me expound a third hypothesis: The *réfugiés* indeed fulfilled the role of the mediators—at least in as much as they could tackle the German language. But this mediating nature could exist only as long as it developed and reinforced everything it consisted of.

#### 4. *Desiderata for the Research*<sup>61</sup>

Fascinating in its fate, informative as compilers, translators and commentators—that was the picture of the 18th-century Berlin *Refuge* and its scholars. Indeed, they were already standing 'on the shoulders of giants'. Only a few of them managed to reach the level of Calvin, Bayle or Le Clerc. The majority of the *Refuge*—except the

---

<sup>59</sup> On Karl's demographical thinking: "K. Karl. [. . .] Was wird ich immermehr, durch diese That [die geplante Ermordung der Protestanten] gewinnen?/ Das Vaterland verlor durch lange Kriege viel:/ [. . .] Soll ich, bedenk es nur! fast Millionen Seelen,/ ein Drittheil meines Volks, zu morden anbefehlen!/ Lehr das die Staatskunst wohl? [. . .]", Johann Christoph Gottsched: *Die Parisische Bluthochzeit König Heinrichs von Navarra, ein Trauerspiel*, in: J. G. C., *Ausgewählte Werke*, hg. v. Joachim Birke. Vol. 2: *Sämtliche Dramen*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter 1970 (Ausgaben deutscher Literatur des XV. bis XVIII. Jahrhunderts), p. 249.

<sup>60</sup> "K. Margaretha. [. . .] Zwar meiner Väter Glauben/ Will, ich soll eifriger auf alle Ketzler seyn:/ Jedoch dein Bild, mein Herr, dein edler Tugendschein/ Macht mich weit menschlicher. Soll da Wahrheit thronen,/ Wo Falschheit und Betrug und Blutbegierde wohnen?" Gottsched: *Die Parisische Bluthochzeit*, p. 244.

<sup>61</sup> See also Sandra Pott: *Huguenots During the Early Modern Period. Observations on Research in Intellectual History in Germany*, in: *Intellectual News*, Spring 2002, pp. 99–102.

‘grand Beausobre’—rather seemed to meet the standards of German school philosophy at the end of the Republic of Scholars. Why then has the *Refuge* still been of interest to researchers in recent years? The material is mainly interesting for historiographic research, but as something highly sophisticated and dynamic, which can be systematically analysed, if only because of the change that can be observed. I would now like to pose some questions of a historical and systematic nature.

(1) The first area of question concerns a subject, which I as a political scientist and as a Germanist am not an expert in, namely ecclesiastical history. And again I’m afraid I’ll have to add a word of self-criticism. Some of you may have wondered about the data in the title of the book which really proved to be of great use. Maybe we should have concentrated on the second phase of the *Refuge*: the years from the rule of Louis XIV to the reinstatement of the French Protestants in the civil rights, that is the period from 1661 to 1791.<sup>62</sup> The first phase covers the beginning of the Reformation in France and the first flights of the *réfugiés*, namely the flight of Lambert of Avignon in the year 1522, up to Nazarin’s death in 1660.<sup>63</sup> So, strictly speaking, the *Refuge* ended in the year 1791, because at this point of time the Huguenots were granted the same status as the Catholic French—at least legally—and they knew that they could return to France in safety. How was this option viewed in Berlin at that time? Were people aware of it all? Or were the *réfugiés*, at least the educated ones, already so much integrated into the life at the academies that there was no more need to return? After all, it was already the third, fourth and fifth generations after those who had come after 1685. They saw how the privileges of the French-Reformed colony in Berlin were done away with in 1809, and how French was steadily being replaced by the German language.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Eugen Lachmann: “Refuge”, in: Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Begründet von J. J. Herzog. In dritter u. verbesserter und vermehrter Auflage unter Mitwirkung vieler Theologen und anderer Gelehrten hg. v. Albert Hauck [. . .]. Vol. 16. Leipzig 1905, pp. 522–536, p. 525.

<sup>63</sup> Lachmann: “Refuge” (footnote 62).

<sup>64</sup> Cyril Buffet: *Fisimatenten. Franzosen in Berlin und Brandenburg/Les Français à Berlin et en Brandebourg*, ed. by the ‘Ausländerbeauftragten des Berliner Senats’. Berlin <sup>2</sup>1998, p. 16.

To discover whether continuities exist in the history of the *Refuge*, it seems useful to first sketch out the stories of the fall and rise within the denomination, and then to analyse which parts of these stories were mere inventions and which parts could have been plausible reflections. In order to achieve this, we would have to measure the dimensions of pre-Reformation movements and we would have to examine the origins of families. Additionally, we would have to inquire after the origins and the effects of the confessional writings. But, following a plea by Notker Hammerstein, the only way to classify and assess the results is “the dialogical treatment of the confessions”,<sup>65</sup> that is to assess the achievements of the scholarly cultures in the recipient countries together with the culture of the *réfugiés* on the one hand, and to have a look at comparable *refuges* on the other hand. Studying the works of, and examining individually the characters themselves of Isaac de Beausobre, Jacques Lenfant, Daniel Ernst Jablonski—who was an expert on Hebrew issues and president of the Academy—, and of the preacher La Placette from Copenhagen, maybe in comparison to his Berlin counterpart, Jacques Abbadie,<sup>66</sup> could prove to be useful.

The second area of question concerns the history of political and moral thinking. Max Weber’s dictum of an “asceticism within the world” still creates impact—and quite rightly, to my mind.<sup>67</sup> These tendencies towards a ‘deconsecration’ of religious morality and towards an earthly “Holiness due to deeds”, as they were described by Weber, are found in the *Refuge* as well. And what’s more, how is it possible to feel a ‘double vocation’, as the preacher and philosopher Formey did? How much continuity existed in the political reflections of the

---

<sup>65</sup> Notker Hammerstein: Staatsanschauungen des 16. Jahrhunderts vor dem Hintergrund der Konfessionalisierung Europas, in: Petrus Canisius SJ (1521–1597). Humanist und Europäer, ed. Rainer Berndt. Berlin: Akademie Verlag 2000, pp. 107–119, p. 108.

<sup>66</sup> For letters to and from La Placette and Jablonski see Det Kongelige Bibliotek (Kopenhagen) and The British Library (London).—For this information I wish to thank Palle Ringsted (Det Kongelige Bibliotek) and Dr. C. J. Wright (The British Library). See also Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg; on Jablonski Dietrich Braun: Daniel Ernst Jablonski, in: Berlinische Lebensbilder. Theologen, ed. Gerd Heinrich. Berlin 1990 (Einzelveröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin 60); Berlinische Lebensbilder 5), pp. 89–109.

<sup>67</sup> See Christoph Strohm: Zur Eigenart der frühen calvinistischen Ethik: Beobachtungen am Beispiel des Calvin-Schülers Lambert Daneau, in: Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte 90 (1999), pp. 230–253, pp. 248f., 253.

*Refuge*, in the theories on the monarchomachs’ right of resistance against tyrants,<sup>68</sup> in Calvin’s ideas on the teaching of the four offices, the continuous mentioning of the circumstances of the Bloody Wedding, the revocation and the flight? And what can we say about their relations with people of different confessions (e.g. with Mosheim)?<sup>69</sup> What standing did unionistic movements, local patronages and ties have (under Frederick I and II)? And finally: were the Reformed teachings closer to political questions than those of Lutheranism?<sup>70</sup>

The third area of question concerns the ‘belles lettres’ in the narrow sense. The importance of the *réfugiés* for French and German literature is still highly underrated. The numerous journals of the *Refuge* are neither taken into account nor analysed properly, although they provide excellent insight into the highly developed discussions of that time.<sup>71</sup> With the exception of Prosper Marchand, details on methods of distribution and publishing are scarce.<sup>72</sup> We also should take a look at the institutional foundations for the production of literature in Berlin: the relationship between Court and Academy.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> See Laursen: Introduction (footnote 9), p. 3.

<sup>69</sup> On ‘confessionalisation’ Harm Kluetting: Die Reformierten im Deutschland des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts und die Konfessionalisierungsdebatte der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft seit ca. 1980, in: Profile des reformierten Protestantismus, ed. Matthias Freudenberg. Wuppertal 1999 (Ender Beiträge zum reformierten Protestantismus 1), pp. 17–47.—For this remark I wish to thank Andreas Flick.

<sup>70</sup> Luise Schorn-Schütte: Evangelische Geistlichkeit in der Frühneuzeit: deren Anteil an der Entfaltung frühmoderner Staatlichkeit und Gesellschaft dargestellt am Beispiel des Fürstentums Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, der Landgrafschaft Hessen-Kassel und der Stadt Braunschweig. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann 1996 (Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte 62), pp. 429f.; Hammerstein: Staatsanschauungen (footnote 65), p. 110.

<sup>71</sup> On Le Clerc’s and Bayle’s journals see the Pierre Bayle Institute; <http://www.kun.nl/pbi/onderz.html>.

<sup>72</sup> Christiane Berkvens-Stevelinck: Prosper Marchand. La vie et l’œuvre (1678–1756). Leiden et al.: Brill 1987 (Studies over de Leidse Universiteit 4).

<sup>73</sup> Conrad Grau: Hugenotten in der Wissenschaft Brandenburg-Preußens Ende des 17. und im 18. Jahrhundert, in: Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 34 (1986), pp. 508–522; Barbara Bauer: Die Anfänge der Berliner ‘Académie Royale des sciences’ im Urteil der gelehrten Öffentlichkeit, in: Europäische Sozietätsbewegung und demokratische Tradition. Die europäischen Akademien der frühen Neuzeit zwischen Frührenaissance und Spätaufklärung, ed. Klaus Garber, Heinz Wismann with Winfried Siebers. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1996 (Frühe Neuzeit 27), vol. 2, pp. 1413–1453. See Jens Häselser: Ein Wanderer zwischen den Welten. Charles Etienne Jordan (1700–1745). Sigmaringen 1993 (Beihefte der Francia 28).

5. *The History of the Effects*

But let us return to Meyerbeer, and by doing so, back to the history of the effects of the *Refuge*. Indeed, the turbulent fate of the *réfugiés* marked the cultural history over a “longue durée”. This black and white pattern of fall and rise, which the Huguenots established themselves, can still be detected today. It had a long tradition in the 19th century. Heinrich Heine’s frenzied enthusiasm for the opera by his friend Meyerbeer is very well known. But it is also possible that the source for Heine’s enthusiasm came as a result of the ball of Rothschild, which took place just after the performance.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, it was commonplace that quite a few of the descendants of the Huguenots, who were well aware of their origins, had effects on German cultural life. Just think of the Daniel Nikolaus Chodowiecki I mentioned earlier, or Willibald Alexis, or Lou Andreas Salomé or of the actress Tilla Durieux.

In this context it is also important not to underrate Theodor Fontane’s commitment to the Berlin Colony.<sup>75</sup> A descendant of Huguenots, not only did he write the *Prologue* to the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Berlin Colony on 1 November, 1885, but also a historic poem *On the 200th Anniversary of the Edict of Potsdam* (29 October, 1885). Both the Prologue and the poem reflected a clear judgement: they took the side of the Huguenots who were wrongly persecuted by the church and by the state,<sup>76</sup> for their enlightened

---

<sup>74</sup> Heinrich Heine’s review was published in the Augsburgian “Allgemeine[n] Zeitung”, 8th of March 1836, in: Heinrich Heine, *Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. 4: *Schriften zu Literatur und Politik II; Vermischtes*. München: Hanser 1972, pp. 531–533.—Heine does not refer on Meyerbeer’s ‘sujet’, but concentrated on his ‘genie’ and—of course—on the concluding dinner at Rothschild’s. See on the reception of the *Refuge* Jochen Desel: *Hugenotten in der Literatur. Eine Bibliographie*. Hugenotten, Waldenser, Wallonen und ihr Umfeld in Erzählung, Biographie, Hagiographie, Drama, Geschichtsschreibung und Gedichten. Bad Karlshafen: Verlag des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins e.V. 1996 (*Geschichtsblätter des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins* 25).

<sup>75</sup> Jean de Pablo: *Theodor Fontanes Verhältnis zur französischen Kolonie zu Berlin*. *Obersichte/Braunschweig* 1967 (*Geschichtsblätter des Deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins* 16/4).

<sup>76</sup> Theodor Fontane: *Zur 200-Jahrfeier des Edikts von Potsdam am 29. Oktober 1885*, in: T. F., *Gedichte II*. Einzelpublikationen, *Gedichte in Prosatextem*, *Gedichte aus dem Nachlaß*, hg. v. Joachim Krueger u. Anita Golz. 2., durchges. u. erweiterte Aufl. Berlin: Aufbau 1995 (*Theodor Fontane, Große Brandenburger Ausgabe; Gedichte*), pp. 86–89, p. 88.

Berlin patron and his people, for the new “home” of the fugitives.<sup>77</sup>

Zweihundert Jahre, daß wir hier zu Land  
 Ein Obdach fanden, Freistatt für den Glauben  
 Und Zuflucht vor Bedrängnis des Gewissens.

Two hundred years that we found shelter  
 In this land, sanctuary for our faith  
 And refuge from distress of our conscience.<sup>78</sup>

Did the Huguenots have any alternatives to flight? Should they have followed Bayle’s example and fought the enemy in their own country? Did an alternative even exist to the deep schism of the Reformation? All these are attractive questions which I would have very much liked to pursue. But I cannot—at least not here. And before we can find answers to these questions, one thing remains true: it is essential to preserve the stories of fall and rise as testimonies for the identity of the faith of a confession; to respect dualism as a model for interpretation, appropriate for the historical situation, and to consider it as a motivation for a critical erudition. I would now like to conclude with this plea, but most certainly not without some critical and some self-critical annotations. Just because they succeeded in portraying themselves as a subdued group, which was the nucleus for something good, refined, intellectually stimulating, man-friendly, humanistic, which would rise again and again in the form of a new Reformation, does not mean we should consider this group to be an excessively subdued culture. They were too closely connected with the local elite and were too dexterous in getting hold of some privileges in comparison to other subdued groups such as the Jews.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Theodor Fontane: Prolog. Zur Feier des 200jährigen Bestehens der Französischen Kolonie (1. November 1885), in: T. F., *Gedichte I* (Sammlung 1898). Aus den Sammlungen ausgeschiedene Gedichte, hg. v. Joachim Krueger u. Anita Golz. 2., durchges. u. erweiterte Aufl. Berlin: Aufbau 1995 (Theodor Fontane; Große Brandenburger Ausgabe; Gedichte), pp. 249f, p. 249.—On Fontane’s text Rolf Geißler: Die Hugenotten im literarischen Leben Berlins, in: *Hugenotten in Berlin*, ed. Bregulla (footnote 20), pp. 363–391, pp. 390f.

<sup>78</sup> Fontane: Prolog.

<sup>79</sup> Dominique Bourel: Lazarus Bendavid und die Akademie zu Berlin, in: *Europäische Sozietätsbewegung*, eds. Garber, Wismann, vol. 2, pp. 1454–1462; Barbara Becker-Cantarino: Die ‘andere Akademie’. Juden, Frauen und Berliner literarische Gesellschaften 1770–1806, in: *Europäische Sozietätsbewegung*, eds. Garber, Wismann (footnote 73), vol. 2, pp. 1463–1477.

But they turned away from these strategies, judged everything by a strict moral standard, related conduct to dualism and developed a very strong internal dynamic of accepting and rejecting things. In this way, the decline of the scholarly *Refuge* can also be explained by internal facts: that is, by how the *Refuge's* own way of thinking evolved.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> I follow Erich Haase: Einführung in die Literatur des Refuge. Der Beitrag der französischen Protestanten zur Entwicklung analytischer Denkformen am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot 1959.



VIEWS OF THE BERLIN *REFUGE*:  
SCHOLARLY PROJECTS, LITERARY INTERESTS,  
MARGINAL FIELDS

Martin Mulso

1

Each and every thing has its front, its back, and its side. This is also true of the Berlin Refuge. Its front side is—we will consider, above all, the first generation of the Berlin Huguenots—the large historical-theological projects realized by this generation: the large works of a Lenfant, a Beausobre, a La Croze, or a Barbeyrac. Its back is more difficult to determine—as is often the case with back sides; I am thinking about those texts which were, rather, published anonymously, which were considered less official, or perhaps intended only to be read in small circles. Finally, as a side, one might denote that which clearly went beyond the intentions of the Huguenots, but which was nonetheless tied together with them: radicalizing, transformation into other contexts, heterodoxy.

We should concede at the outset, that it is, of course, problematic to want to set a province, or a region, apart from the *Republique des lettres*. One might well imagine the Republic of Letters to function like a hologram or the human memory; information is not saved locally there, but is distributed over the entire network; in a certain manner, every individual place represents the whole. In this way, nothing of the holographic image is destroyed when a portion of the carrying plate is removed. It only diminishes the quality, or the resolution. This is also true of the Huguenot *Republique des lettres*. In Berlin, just as in London or Amsterdam, the large debates and positions were present: the side of Jurieu, with his prophetic-political actionism, the rationalism of Le Clerc or Jaquelot, Bayle's quietistic skepticism, the defensive battle against the French Catholics, or the continuous problem of Socinianism.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The best account of these debates is still the book by Erich Haase: Einführung

In this way, what interests us is, rather, the local color, which this whole European discourse had acquired in Berlin; the specific close connections within intellectual networks, which were made possible through personal exchanges, and continuous presence; moreover the shaping of the Berlin Refuge through its unique conditions: namely, French refugees working within the Calvinistic ruling-classes of a principally Lutheran Brandenburg, later, Prussia.

Whenever, in the following discussion, I ask about the large scholarly projects (and their small back sides), the scholarly projects of the first generation of Berlin Huguenots, who were working into the 1730's, then I am asking about two things. First, we must reconstruct the questions to which these historical-theological scholarly projects were answers; what type of answer was produced in each case, depending upon which challenges were seen as most pressing? Secondly, though in connection with the first, we must evaluate the components within these answers; how were morals, theology, history, and law intertwined in each case? How were the specific interweavings of moral-theology, history of dogma, religious natural right or history of morals, formed?

These are large questions, and I would like merely to outline my theses and set them out for discussion. In any case, through such questions, one obtains, I believe, the opportunity to identify a certain unity in the publishing jungle of the Refuge.

The historical projects of the Huguenots were, of course, mostly responses to Catholic challenges, above all reactions to texts written by the chief Catholic thinkers and historians such as Bossuet and Maimbourg.<sup>2</sup> This is true of Bayle's *Critique generale*, which is a response to Maimbourg's history of Calvinism,<sup>3</sup> just as Jacques Basnage's *Histoire de l'Eglise* is a response to Bousset's *Histoire des variations des*

---

in die Literatur des Refuge. Der Beitrag der französischen Protestanten zur Entwicklung analytischer Denkformen am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts. Berlin 1959.

<sup>2</sup> For Bossuet see Alfred Rébelliau: Bossuet, historien du protestantisme. Paris 1909; in general: Jean Meyer: Bossuet. Paris 1993. For Maimbourg see most recently: Jean-Louis Quantin: Croisades et supercroisades: les "Histoires" de Maimbourg et la politique de Louis XIV, in: Les princes et l'histoire du XIV<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, ed. Chantal Grell, Werner Paravicini und Jürgen Voss. Bonn 1998, pp. 619–644.

<sup>3</sup> See now Sally L. Jenkinson: The Public Context of Heresy: Bayle, Maimbourg, and Le Clerc, in: Histories of Heresy in Early Modern Europe. For, Against, and Beyond Persecution and Toleration, ed. John Chr. Laursen. New York 2002, pp. 119–138; Jacques Solé: Le débat entre Protestants et Catholiques français de 1598 à 1685. Paris 1985.

*églises protestantes*—just to name two examples. When Bossuet described the splintering of the Protestants as a sign of their not being inspired by the Spirit and thus their illegitimacy, Basnage reacted with a monumental enumeration of the splintering of the early church that reached all the way to those movements which were denounced as heretical in the Middle Ages.<sup>4</sup> Basnage fertilized the field of ecclesiology for his confessional reply.

The historiography of the Refuge (no differently from its theology) is, in this sense, of an essentially confessional character, and, as such, biased. The problem is that the good historians—and Lenfant, Beausobre, and La Croze are to be counted among these—attempted, at the same time, to outdo their Catholic opponents by being more faithful to the facts and less biased. This combination of responding to biased texts, for confessional reasons, while adhering to a maximum of impartiality, makes their work quite difficult to judge (as for example Myriam Yardeni has pointed out),<sup>5</sup> but also quite interesting. The best examples of these make for milestones of the beginning of the Enlightenment. A simple delimitation between the epochs of Confessionalism and Enlightenment is, in any case, not possible, and would underestimate exactly this internal dynamism from confessional competition towards impartiality.

Turning now to the Berlin Refuge, I will select as examples the projects of Barbeyrac, Lenfant, La Croze, and Beausobre. I would like, in advance, to list the answers—or, answer types—which, I will argue, are embodied in these projects: the moral history of the patristics in Barbeyrac, the history of pre-reformation conciliarism in Lenfant, the critical history of missions in La Croze, and the Gnostic pre-history of the Reformation in Beausobre.

I begin with Jean Barbeyrac, because, in a certain way, he constitutes an exception, rather than the rule, of the Berlin Refugees, since he created too many problems for them during his short time

---

<sup>4</sup> Jacques Basnage de Beauval: *Histoire de l'église depuis Jesus-Christ jusqu'à present*. 2 vols. Rotterdam 1699. See the 'Preface' with direct reference to Bossuet. For Basnage see E. A. Mailhet: *Jacques Basnage, théologien, controversiste, diplomate et historien: sa vie et ses écrits*. Genf 1880; G. Cerny: *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization: Jacques Basnage (1653–1723) and the Baylean Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic*. Dordrecht 1987.

<sup>5</sup> See Miriam Yardeni: *Erudition et engagement: l'historiographie huguenote dans la Prusse des Lumières*, in: *Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte* 9 (1981), pp. 584–601.

in Berlin until 1708. Barbeyrac supplemented the natural law of Pufendorf with the components of a religiously defined moral philosophy and a critical history of morality.<sup>6</sup> The reason for this supplementing was that Barbeyrac recognized the natural law as part of a moral philosophy, that has to begin with the inclinations and affections of human beings, and to be orientated toward the striving after perfection. The challenge for him consisted of managing this synthesis. History of morality, then, takes on the function of opening the way to a rational morality through criticizing false authorities. Especially the criticism of the authority of the church fathers is, in this context, a skeptical counter-strategy adopted from Daillé, which had been used by the Calvinists to defend their rational and scriptural faith against the skeptical criticism of the Catholics.<sup>7</sup> Barbeyrac's *Traité de la morale des Pères de l'Eglise* from 1728 had carried out this program, which had only been outlined in the preface of Barbeyrac's great Pufendorf translation.<sup>8</sup> The *pars destruens* of history of morality is to be held in relief against the *pars construens* of liberal moral philosophy and natural law. The moral philosophy sets the critical benchmark for the examination of theology and history, but is still seen from the perspective of a religion understood in light of Arminianism.

Jacques Lenfant's great church history project was the description of conciliarism in the 15th Century. He composed three books, respectively about the Council of Pisa (1409), of Constance (1415), and of Basel (1431)—the last of them together with a description of the Hussite War.<sup>9</sup> Why? Conciliarism had been the attempt to overcome the authority problem which arose from the Papal schism and the reform-filibuster.<sup>10</sup> In this way Conciliarism constitutes a part of

---

<sup>6</sup> For Barbeyrac see the contribution by Fabrizio Lomonaco in this volume; Simone Zurbuchen: *Naturrecht und natürliche Religion. Zur Geschichte des Toleranzproblems von Samuel Pufendorf bis Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Würzburg 1991; generally Tim Hochstrasser: *Natural Law Theories in the Early Enlightenment*. Cambridge 2000.

<sup>7</sup> See Jean Daillé: *De usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita, quae sunt hodie controversa, libri duo*. Geneva 1655.

<sup>8</sup> Jean Barbeyrac: *Traité de la morale des Pères de l'Eglise*. Amsterdam 1728; idem: *Preface du Traducteur*, in: Samuel Pufendorf: *Le droit de la nature et des gens*. Amsterdam 1706.

<sup>9</sup> Jacques Lenfant: *Histoire du concile de Constance*. Amsterdam 1714, idem: *Histoire du concile de Pise*. Amsterdam 1724, idem: *Histoire de la guerre des Hussites et du concile de Basle*. Amsterdam 1731.

<sup>10</sup> For Conciliarism see R. Bäumer (Hg.): *Die Entwicklung des Konziliarismus*, Darmstadt 1976.

the pre-history of the Reformation, and this was interesting to the Protestants. When Lenfant described the history of the large councils in the century before the Reformation, he then opened a larger space in which he could show not only the corruption of the church from that time, but, even more, in which he could bring to light and rehabilitate the striving after reform which had existed at that time. Contrary to Catholic historiography, which saw only heresy here, Lenfant attempted to cast a historically accurate gaze on figures such as Jan Hus and others. At any rate, Lenfant might have found in Paolo Sarpi a model for how to paint Conciliar historiography against the Papist brush strokes.<sup>11</sup>

Historical exactness against distorted historical views: this is Lenfant's motto. A moralistic motto, next to which the theological orientation stands clearly in the background. History was the means to theologially discredit the opposition.

Mathurin Veyssière La Croze was not really a Huguenot. He was a Benedictine in the Maurine Abbey of Saint-Germain des Prés, before in 1696, as a result of discontentedness with the confessional-political situation, he fled to Berlin by way of Basel.<sup>12</sup> Although now in Calvinistic surroundings, La Croze was able to retain the Maurine impact of his projects, namely the examination of tradition against the ideological uses of history by the Jesuits. In the same way that Mabillon had established his historical methodology against the historical skepticism of the Bollandist Papebrooch,<sup>13</sup> La Croze, through his argument with the historical Pyrrhonism of Jean Hardouin, developed a new form of writing church history. La Croze's books about the Christian community in India founded by the apostle Thomas, or about Christianity in Armenia or Ethiopia, can be understood as 'Jesuit-proof', that is, immune especially against the dangers of doubt in and forgery of church history.<sup>14</sup> Hardouin had used the weapon

---

<sup>11</sup> For Sarpi's historiography see Gaetano Cozzi: *Paolo Sarpi tra Venezia e l'Europa*. Torino 1979; David Wooton: *Paolo Sarpi. Between Renaissance and Enlightenment*. Cambridge 1983.

<sup>12</sup> For La Croze: see Martin Mulsov: *Die drei Ringe. Toleranz und clandestine Gelehrsamkeit bei Mathurin Veyssière La Croze (1661–1739)*. Tübingen 2001. There one can find the references to older secondary literature.

<sup>13</sup> See Bernardine Barret-Kriegel: *Les historiens et la monarchie*. 4 vols. Paris 1988ff.

<sup>14</sup> Mathurin Veyssière La Croze: *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*. Den Haag 1724; idem: *Histoire du Christianisme d'Éthiopie et d'Arménie*. Amsterdam 1734.

of antiquarianism (in the form of numismatics) against tradition, and declared numerous texts from antiquity to be inauthentic.<sup>15</sup> At least as far as La Croze suspected, Hardouin had then replaced these with the Papistically prepared forgeries of history and the absolute rule of the Tridentine-blessed Vulgata Bible. Against this strategy, La Croze set the rehabilitation of previously suppressed traditions of Christianity such as the Nestorians, and, as the living, and not philologically-falsifiable, evidence of the worth of this tradition, he cited the reports of missionaries of his day who described the remaining groups of these traditions, such as had been discovered in India. In my book on La Croze I examine this in greater detail.<sup>16</sup>

In La Croze's work, the components of dogmatic theology take a back seat to the criterium of a morally impeccable and tolerant Christianity. His history is written in order to expose the oppressiveness of history written from the standpoint of the victor. Philological competence and history of missions are the aids to his historiography; they bring to light the original truth of the simple and pure rites of early Christianity. Law and philosophy play only a secondary role in this model.

Finally, we come to Isaac de Beausobre.<sup>17</sup> During his life, he did not publish much, but after his death it became apparent just how enormous was the project on which he had worked for his entire life: a history of the Reformation including the entire host of its religiously historical forerunners. The two gigantic volumes of the *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (only the first of the two was published during his lifetime) were only the beginning;<sup>18</sup> the planned third volume was to have discussed the newer heretics who had been accused of being Manichean. In the whole of Beausobre's Nachlaß, the projected works were partially available: histories of the Paulicians, the Bogomiles, the Waldensians, the Albigensians, and the Bohemian

---

<sup>15</sup> For Hardouin see now Anthony Grafton: The Antiquary as Pariah, in: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 62 (1999), pp. 241–267.

<sup>16</sup> Mulsow (footnote 12), pp. 36–54.

<sup>17</sup> For Beausobre see the contribution by John Christian Laursen in this volume; Bertram Schwarzbach: Politics and Ethics in the Huguenot Diaspora: Isaac de Beausobre in Berlin, in: *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. John Christian Laursen. Leiden 1995, pp. 109–130.

<sup>18</sup> Isaac de Beausobre: *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme*. 2 vols. Amsterdam 1734/39.

Bretheren.<sup>19</sup> Basnage had, indeed, already dealt with the last of these topics in the forth part of his *Histoire de l'église*, but not specifically in light of such sophisticated background knowledge of Manicheism. Finally, as a conclusion, came Beausobre's history of the Reformation itself, first published in four volumes in 1785–6.<sup>20</sup> They had developed as a revision of Seckendorf's response to Maimbourg's *Histoire du Lutheranisme*—the responsory structure is, therefore, also visible here.<sup>21</sup>

What does the tapestry of the previously discussed interweaving of morals, theology, history and law look like in Beausobre's work? As a response to the moral dilemma of theodicy, Bayle had brought the Manicheans into play: the existence of a principle of evil would exonerate God, and would not be rationally refutable.<sup>22</sup> Therein, however, a sensitivity was produced: could not the dualistic tendencies of the ancient and medieval heretics be acknowledged as legitimate forerunners of the Reformation? Where did the roots of this dualism lie? Beausobre accused Bayle of having forgotten his own historical-critical principles in his Manichean sympathies and attempted to compensate for that failing.<sup>23</sup>

Beausobre, in that he precisely followed the history of the Manichean religion, and traced its origins from Syrian, Arabian, and Persian sources, distanced himself from Bayle's positions. The result was the portrayal of a Zoroastrian kernel of Manicheism, which approached the ideal for a rational religion. In this way, Zoroaster, as Beausobre, following Hyde and Prideaux,<sup>24</sup> argued, had become a reformer of

---

<sup>19</sup> See Frédéric Hartweg: *Le grand Beausobre. Aspects des intellectuels et kirchlichen Lebens der ersten Generation des Berliner Refuge*, in: *Geschichte als Aufgabe. Festschrift für Otto Büsch*, ed. Wilhelm Treue. Berlin 1988, pp. 55–82.

<sup>20</sup> Isaac de Beausobre: *Histoire de la Réformation, ou origine et progrès du Lutheranisme dans l'empire et les Etats de la Confession d'Augsbourg, depuis 1517 jusqu'en 1530*. Berlin 1785/86.

<sup>21</sup> Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf: *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutheranismu seu de reformatione*. Frankfurt und Leipzig 1692; Louis Maimbourg: *Histoire du luthéranisme*. Paris 1680. See Hartweg (footnote 19).

<sup>22</sup> Pierre Bayle: *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. Rotterdam 1697, Art. 'Manichéens' und 'Pauliciens'; see Elisabeth Labrousse: *Pierre Bayle. Hétérodoxie et rigorisme*. Den Haag 1964, pp. 346–386.

<sup>23</sup> See Michael Stausberg: *Faszination Zarathushtra. Zoroaster und die Europäische Religionsgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit*. Berlin 1998; Ralph Häfner: *Die Fässer des Zeus. Ein Homerisches Mythologem und seine Aufnahme in die Manichäismusdebatte in Deutschland am Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Scientia Poetica* 1 (1997), pp. 35–61.

<sup>24</sup> Thomas Hyde: *Historia religionis veterum Persarum, eorumque magorum*.

the religion of the Magi, and had produced a monotheistic religion, which overcame primitive dualism, and distinguished itself through purity of faith, honesty of speech, and holiness of acts. This was exactly in keeping with the Protestant ideal of a simple and moral Christianity, such as was favored both by Beausobre and La Croze.<sup>25</sup> Here we see a close relationship between theology and history through moral standards; moral history once more defines historical efforts. The moral theme of evil that Bayle raised, is the starting point for Beausobre, but quickly makes way for a vision of a pure, non-Spinozistic primal religion.

This is my attempt, so far, to bring some perspective to the intellectual milieu of the Refuge. I do not need to stress just how much I have already left out, such as the philosophical component of Cartesianism. One could, for example, ask how Cartesianism and natural right were associated in Chauvin's work; or, what role the thoughts of Leibniz played in the Berlin colony? Unfortunately, we cannot go into all of this here.

2

At the beginning I claimed that the Refuge also had a back side. What do I mean by this? An unmade bed? A gaffe? A bunch of illegitimate children? In the intellectual sense, this is exactly what I mean. We shall begin with one case, where the relationship of such things with the large scholarly projects are obvious. As Lenfant worked on his history of the Council of Constance, he stumbled across the figure of Poggio Bracciolini. The humanist Poggio was a participant in the council, and also happened to be an observer of Hieronymus of Prague's speech for the defence of Hus, to whom Poggio, though being Papal secretary, paid the highest respect. Now, Poggio is a person who not only candidly pronounced himself to be in favor of church reform, but had also published a collection of farcial folktales under the title *Facetae*.<sup>26</sup> Lenfant became fascinated by this

---

Oxford 1700; Humphrey Prideaux: *The Old and New Testament connected in the History of the Jews and Neighbouring Nations*. London 1716/18.

<sup>25</sup> Vgl. Mulsow: *Die drei Ringe* (footnote 12), pp. 45ff.

<sup>26</sup> For Poggio see the volume: *Poggio Bracciolini 1380–1980: Nel 6. centenario della nascita*. Firenze 1982.



mish-mash, and as a digression, so to speak, from his serious work, also took the liberty of publishing the Poggio material he had gathered; it appeared anonymously in Amsterdam in 1720 as the two volume *Poggiana*.<sup>27</sup>

The anonymity (and the polemic against the Italian—and, naturally, Catholic—Poggio-publisher Giovanni Recanati)<sup>28</sup> shows us that Lenfant was playing with fire. In the *Bibliothèque germanique*, Lenfant had supplemented the *Poggiana* with a letter to his friend, La Croze, which makes clear how intensely this theme was debated from both sides.<sup>29</sup> La Croze, you see, possessed a proclivity for such things. All his life, he had intended to write a book about Pietro Aretino, though he certainly never dared to carry it out. Nevertheless, it was rumored that he had a secret passion for pornographic texts.<sup>30</sup> That misses the point, however. Aretino, with his combination of anti-clericalism and libertine-obscene writing, presents a similar case to Poggio, with his combination of political interests, and utilization of such farces.<sup>31</sup> Take even Boccaccio; La Croze was a great enthusiast of Boccaccio, but a connoisseur not only of his lascivious novellas, but also of the third novella of the first day, the Parable of the Rings. For La Croze not only corresponded with the collector Uffenbach over erotic Italian literature, but also copied out, with his own revisions, a French verse adaptation of the Parable of the Rings, in which the fable of tolerance was adapted to the situation of the Huguenot Refuge.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> [Jacques Lenfant:] *Poggiana ou la vie, le caractere, les sentences, et les bons mots de Pogge Florentin. Avec son Histoire de la Republique de Florence, et un Supplement des diverses Pieces importantes*. 2 vols. Amsterdam 1720. Lenfant's reception of Poggio is part of a more general enthusiasm for early humanism by early enlightenment thinkers; a humanism, however, which was esteemed also in its burlesque, epicureic, lively aspects—in contrast to the reduced humanism of the classicism of the 19th century. See, for instance, Jean Le Clerc's edition of Erasmus. Lenfant was a good friend of Le Clerc since Le Clerc's time as a student in Geneva.

<sup>28</sup> See Giovanni B. Recanati: *Osservazioni critiche ed apologetiche sopra il libro del Sig. Jacobo Lenfant intitolato Poggiana*. Venezia 1721.

<sup>29</sup> Lenfant to La Croze, in: *Bibliothèque germanique*. vol. 1. Amsterdam 1720, pp. 240–250.

<sup>30</sup> See Mulsow: *Die drei Ringe* (footnote 12), pp. 88f., 98f.

<sup>31</sup> See Paula Findlen: *Humanismus, Politik und Pornographie im Italien der Renaissance*, in: *Die Erfindung der Pornographie. Obszönität und die Ursprünge der Moderne*, ed. Lynn Hunt. Frankfurt 1994, pp. 44–114.

<sup>32</sup> See Mulsow (footnote 12), especially pp. S. 98–108.

Let's take another example. Charles Ancillon had written a history of the Turkish Sultan, Soliman II, in 1706, and dedicated it to the son of the Court chancellor.<sup>33</sup> Ancillon was thus well-informed over Oriental customs, such as the harem. In 1707, this text was followed by an anonymous, and not completely official treatise on eunuchs, *Traité des Eunuques*—a piece of 'impolite learning' that Anne Goldgar has overlooked.<sup>34</sup> In it, the different modes of the world of eunuchs are described with obvious relish, before the author poses the delicate legal question of whether they are suitable for marriage, and whether admittance to this institution should be permitted them.<sup>35</sup>

Ancillon personifies a type of literary and historically erudite jurists. He was high court judge of all French courts in Prussia, and he is concerned with his 'curious' subject from the juridical standpoint. In fact, there existed a juridical mock-treatise from a certain Jacob Möller, who in 1692 had written two *Discursus [. . .] theologico-juridici* over the legal rights of cuckolds and hermaphrodites.<sup>36</sup> Ancillon took these, as well as the pornographic *Cérémonies du mariage*, as paradigms,<sup>37</sup> when, in his dedication letter to his "old friend" Pierre Bayle (who had, of course, just recently died), he professes that the *castrati* of his patron, that is, the Italian singers at court, had been the immediate cause for writing this legal brief.

Finally, after Lenfant, La Croze, and Ancillon, yet a fourth case. Jacob Le Duchat was a scholar who specialized in literature, and who was not as prominent in the Refuge. From Le Duchat, we possess the material which Formey published posthumously in 1738 as

---

<sup>33</sup> Charles Ancillon: *Histoire de la vie de Soliman second, Empereur des Turcs*. Rotterdam 1706.

<sup>34</sup> Anne Goldgar: *Impolite Learning. Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680–1750*. New Haven 1995.

<sup>35</sup> C. D'Ollincan [= Charles Ancillon:] *Traité des Eunuques dans lequel on explique toutes les différentes sortes d'Eunuches, quel rang ils ont tenu, et quel cas on en a fait, &c. On examine principalement s'ils sont propres au Mariage, et s'il leurs doit être permis de se marier [. . .]*. s.l. 1707.

<sup>36</sup> Jacob Möller [Möller:] *Discursus duo philologico-juridici, prior de Cornutis, posterior de Hermaphroditis eorumque iure, uterque ex Jure Divino, Canonico, Civili, variisque historicorum monumentis, horis otiosis congesti*. Frankfurt 1692; New edition Berlin 1708 (by Ancillon?) At least through the presence of Ancillon's tract, there had possibly emerged a certain request for themes like this in the Berlin Refuge. See for this special subject already the infamous book by Antonio Beccadelli ("il Panormita"): *Hermaphroditus* (1425).

<sup>37</sup> *Les Cérémonies du mariage*; this text had been reviewed by Bayle in his *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, Janvier 1704, p. 117.

*Ducatiana*.<sup>38</sup> Le Duchat was an expert of French literature in the tradition of Rabelais. The *Ducatiana* further the publications of Menage, de Thou, and Bayle: anecdotes on satirical and libertine writers, observations, and corrections. Le Duchat shows yet again how well this type of literature was known to certain circles within the Refuge.

Now, what are we to conclude from all of this? Besides the “official” products of learned competition to Catholic historiography, there was obviously a somewhat diffuse sphere of unofficial works and predilections, the style of which which could border on the lowest levels of lascivious, obscene and erotic. This sphere, however, is not to be dismissed merely as possibly embarrassing compensational work, but rather, I think, it taps into the same source from which even the official projects sprung.<sup>39</sup> To understand these connections, perhaps it helps to bear in mind the spirits of Menage, of La Monnoye, and, above all, of Bayle. Didn’t philological criticism, interest in obscenities, tolerance, and fideism go hand in hand into Bayle’s *Dictionnaire*? Didn’t the appeal of this work lay in exactly this? Didn’t the critical ability of distanciation<sup>40</sup> from intellectual authorities and positions of the past and present, which permitted him to charge the Biblical king David with dissipation, make it possible to conceive of the coexistence of different religions—or even the coexistence with atheists in the state?<sup>41</sup> Did not also perhaps the same self-distanciation on the one hand allow a critical account of the past to be written, and on the other hand allow one to go beyond the all too constrictive ideas of decorum?

So, when I propose to consider the intellectual debates and ‘impolite learning’ together, when, as it were, I hope to see Haase and Goldgar together, then I can demonstrate the profit to be gained by

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ducatiana* ou remarques de feu M. Le Duchat, recueillie par M. Formey. Amsterdam 1738.

<sup>39</sup> See on the grey area and the interweavings between satirical literature, libertine philology and erudition Martin Mulsow: *Subversive Kommentierung. Burleske Kommentarpodien, Gegenkommentare und Libertinismus in der frühen Neuzeit*. Forthcoming in: *Der Kommentar in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Ralph Häfner and Markus Völkel.

<sup>40</sup> See Carlo Ginzburg: *Mythos. Distanz und Lüge*, in idem: *Holzaugen. Über Distanz und Nähe*. Berlin 1999, pp. 42–96.

<sup>41</sup> See Pierre Bayle: *Dictionnaire* (footnote 22), esp. the IV. *Eclaircissement* “Que s’il y a des Obscénitez dans ce Livre, elles sont de celles qu’on ne peut censurer avec raison”; idem: *Pensées diverses* [. . .]. Rotterdam 1683.

uniting these two perspectives into a stereoscopic view: namely, a much greater depth of field. The bringing together of a classical history of ideas on the one side, and a modern history of hidden communication and symbolic strategies on the other, it indeed appears to me to be only the first point on the agenda of a future reconstruction of Huguenot culture.<sup>42</sup> The second would be a “constellation analysis”, which is then plugged into the reconsideration of the scholarly projects of the authors. Constellation analyses consist of reconstructing how persons of a network interact, with respect to their intellectual creativity.<sup>43</sup> A journal such as the *Bibliothèque germanique*, for example, is a point of crystallization in which one can observe these constellations at work.<sup>44</sup> Even the daily exchanges, however, the support structures, utilized time and again between La Croze, Lenfant, Beausobre, Des Vignoles and others, which are evident from the footnotes of their respective works, offer material for a constellation analysis. La Croze translated Armenian sources for Beausobre,<sup>45</sup> Beausobre informed Lenfant about the background of the accusations against the Hussites, Des Vignoles supported La Croze by chronologically disproving Hardouin’s argument,<sup>46</sup> Barbeyrac utilized La Croze in his dismantling of the church fathers<sup>47</sup>—to say

---

<sup>42</sup> See in this respect Martin Mulsow: Unanständigkeit. Zur Mißachtung und Verteidigung des Decorum in der Gelehrtenrepublik der Frühen Neuzeit, in: *Historische Anthropologie* 8 (2000), pp. 98–118; see as well Lorraine Daston: The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment, in: *Science in Context* 4 (1991), pp. 367–386.

<sup>43</sup> See Dieter Henrich: *Konstellationen—Probleme und Debatten am Ursprung der idealistischen Philosophie 1789–1795*. Stuttgart 1991; I am currently organizing a volume on constellation analysis together with Dieter Henrich and Marcelo Stamm.

<sup>44</sup> See Sandra Pott: *Reformierte Morallehren und deutsche Literatur von Jean Barbeyrac bis Christoph Martin Wieland*. Tübingen 2002; eadem: *Critica perennis*, in: *Praktiken der Gelehrsamkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Helmut Zedelmaier and Martin Mulsow. Tübingen 2001.

<sup>45</sup> See *Histoire critique des Manichées* (footnote 18), passim in the footnotes.

<sup>46</sup> See Alphonse Des Vignoles, as an appendix of La Croze’s *Vindiciae veterum scriptorum contra J. Harduinum*. Rotterdam 1708, pp. 225–292.

<sup>47</sup> Barbeyrac cites La Croze (without mentioning his name), by referring to his anonymously published *Dissertations historiques sur divers sujets*. Rotterdam 1707, in the second edition of his famous ‘Préface du traducteur’ in Pufendorf’s *Le droit de la nature et des gens* (1712), in § 10 which is directed against the church fathers. I quote from the edition Leiden 1759, vol. 1, p. XLVI: “Un, Auteur, qui ne peut pas être soupçonné de vouloir du mal aux Pères, nous l’appendra. ‘Les Sectes, dit-il, des Nestoriens & des Eutychiens nées en partie de l’oisiveté & de la superstition, & en partie des haines particulières, de l’envie & de la malignité des Ecclésiastiques,

nothing of Beausobre's and Lenfant's joint translation of the New Testament.<sup>48</sup>

In any case, only with such analyses can the attempt to get beyond a local historiography, and to reach a reconstruction of specific conversational collaborations and discussion contents in the presence of a complete picture, stereoscopically comprehended, of the Huguenot republic of Letters, be successful.

## 3

That, which I have said about the backside of the Refuge, however, is not all there is to tell. A network of scholarly academic projects, and of people constantly exchanging information with each other, did not have only internal backsides, it also had external borders and gray areas. As *marges*, Jacques Derrida indicates that border zones, and, at the same time, discretionary spaces are that, which from philosophy is left as external *extra muros*, but at the same time defines that which is the internal.<sup>49</sup> In this sense, then, are there also *marges* of the Berlin Refuge? Are there Freudian slips of suppressed ideas? Even when the majority of the Berlin Refuge was moderately orthodox—and indeed they showed this to be the case in their conflict with Barbeyrac—, there was, in their scholarly work, as well as in their previously described unofficial backside, ample discretionary space for such slips of the pen. Indeed, these gray areas are both darker and harder to make out than the back sides. In contrast to the back sides, at stake in the borders were not only problematic issues of decorum, which were nonetheless indifferent to dogmatics, but also core principles of the Calvinist world view.

---

mirent la dernière main à l'intolérance en matière de Religion. Il est vrai qu'elle étoit déjà née, cette intolérance: mais elle n'avoit pas encore exercé sa tyrannie, avec toutes les cruautés dont elle a été accompagnée depuis le malheureux Siècle, auquel on se divisa pour des opinions, dans lesquelles il peut y avoir quelque chose de réel, mais dont il auroit été aisé de convenir, si l'esprit du Christianisme avoit présidé dans les assemblées ecclésiastiques.” [the last two phrases have been printed spaced out.] See also the reference to La Croze on p. LII: “Un Auteur, que j'ai déjà cité, l'avoue formellement [. . .].”

<sup>48</sup> Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ [. . .] avec des notes littérales pour éclaircir le texte. 2 vols. Amsterdam 1718.

<sup>49</sup> Jacques Derrida: Tympanon, in idem: *Marges de la philosophie*. Paris 1972.

One can understand these border areas in multiple senses: as groups, geographies and dogmatics marginalized with respect to the Berlin Refuge. One group marginalized from the Berlin Refuge was, for example, the German Calvinist intellectuals, who often collaborated closely with the French; one might think about Paul Ernst Jablonski's pupilship to La Croze.<sup>50</sup> Geographically marginalized might have been the Middle German sphere around Berlin, such as the Prussian universities in Halle and Frankfurt an der Oder. Dogmatically marginalized were, most importantly, those notorious problematic points: Socinianism, Skepticism, and Spinozism. All of these aspects overlap each other, since dogmatic precariousness seldom emerges in the center, but rather on the social and geographical edges. At this point, I can only make a few suggestions and toss out some ideas, which might be pursued later.<sup>51</sup>

In many senses, one border figure of the Berlin Refuge was Christoph Heinrich Olevén, a conservative *demi-savant* with access to the Prussian court, who, among other things, led a smear campaign against La Croze.<sup>52</sup> Olevén interests me as a symptom of the complex relationship between the Refuge and the philosophers of the early German Enlightenment. As Olevén reviewed Gundling's 1705 *Otia*, he smelled therein the rat of Bayle's thinking, and exclaimed: "Under the pretext of this supposed criticism they [the emulators of Bayle] take for themselves the liberty to doubt God himself and his words, to reject sound principles, to introduce a monstrosity called *bel esprit*, to corrupt morals, and to place *fdem historicam* after their blind and stale *videtur* [. . .]."<sup>53</sup> Olevén set skepticism on the same level with libertinism and saw in both the tendency to descend to hell, that is, to atheism.

---

<sup>50</sup> For collaboration and contacts between Germans and Frenchmen in Berlin as early as the time of Jablonski's father, Daniel Ernst, see Ferdinand Petri: Die Spanheimgesellschaft in Berlin 1689–1697, in: Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum des Königlichen Wilhelms-Gymnasiums am 17. Mai 1908. Berlin 1908, pp. 121–142.

<sup>51</sup> See, in general for these subjects Jonathan I. Isreal: *Radical Enlightenment. Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750*. Oxford 2001.

<sup>52</sup> See Mulsow: *Die drei Ringe* (footnote 12), pp. 72ff.; Goldgar (footnote 34), pp. 168f.

<sup>53</sup> [Christoph Heinrich Olevén:] *Wöchentliche Curieuse Natur- Kunst- Staats- und Sitten-Praesenten*. Berlin 1708, 2. Stück, pp. 34f.: "Unter dem Praetext dieser vermeintlichen Critique nehmen sie [die Nachahmer Bayles] sich die Freyheit von Gott selber und seinem Worte zu zweiffeln, die gesunde Principia zu verwerffen, ein Monstrum so *bel esprit* heißt einzuführen, die Morale zu corrumpieren [und]

Allow me to take Oleven's denunciations and concerns seriously for a moment. The research on clandestine literature has shown us that the visions of the conservatives were not always completely wrong. I have spoken above of the effect of distancing through the skeptical-libertine *culture littéraire*, which aimed, above all, at the question of decorum. Indeed, even in the more serious fields of history, jurisprudence, and theology, this culture led to effects of distancing. Oleven categorized the skepticism of the early-Enlightenment thinkers from Halle with concepts which he gathered from the Berlin Refuge; for him, they were "Baylians". If one wants to follow the radical offspring of the Halle early-Enlightenment thinkers, who eventually wandered into Clandestine borders, this categorizing is not sufficient, but it gets us going in the right direction. One merely needs to trace back the skeptical-libertine tradition, to names such as Menage and Gassendi. Then one stumbles on—though in French categories, mind you—a Wittenberg professor by the name of Georg Michael Heber. This is a man who has recently been suspected of being the author of the skeptical-atheistic clandestine manuscript *Symbolum sapientiae*.<sup>54</sup>

Exactly as Oleven had thought: Skepticism could occur not only with respect to history, but also to philosophy, law, and even theology. The last of these is the case of *Symbolum sapientiae*. However, even if Heber should turn out not to be the author of the *Symbolum* and thus advocate a theological skepticism, he was certainly a juridical skeptic, and particularly one who addressed himself to "lucid minds", those who had been called *bel esprits* by Oleven.<sup>55</sup>

---

fidem historicam ihrem blinden und abgeschmackten videtur nachzusetzen [...].” See Gerhard Sauder: Bayle-Rezeption in der deutschen Aufklärung (Mit einem Anhang: In Deutschland verlegte französische Bayle-Ausgaben und deutsche Übersetzungen Baylescher Werke), in: Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte 49 (1975): Sonderheft, pp. 83\*–104\*; here pp. 93\*f.

<sup>54</sup> See Winfried Schröder: Il contesto storico, la datazione, gli autori e l'influenza su pensiero dell' epoca, in: Cymbalum mundi sive Symbolum sapientiae. Edizione critica a cura di Guido Canziani, Winfried Schröder e Francisco Socas. Milano 2000, pp. 9–35, here pp. 26f.; Martin Mulsov: Moderne aus dem Untergrund. Radikale Frühaufklärung in Deutschland 1680–1720. Hamburg 2002, p. 238. For Heber's biography see Johann Heinrich Zedler: Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon. Leipzig und Halle 1732ff. vol. 13, col. 1024f.

<sup>55</sup> Georg Michael Heber: Scepticismus Juridicus Wittebergensis, in: Historia sapientiae et stultitiae, ed. Christian Thomasius. Halle 1693, pp. 124–134; here p. 126: "His, qui amant bonam mentem."

Let's look, however, before we leap. Heber was in Paris in the late 1670's and early 1680's,<sup>56</sup> where he lingered in the circles of Henri Justel and Gilles Menage. Justel was a Calvinist, a lawyer, and a historian, who in these years had formed a well-known circle around himself, which even Leibniz had frequented since 1673. David Ancillon, the father of Charles and, incidentally, minister at the Berlin Refuge at the end of his life, was at that time one of the best friends, and young adjutants of Justel.<sup>57</sup> Heber's second Parisian teacher, the literary critic and language historian Menage, was Catholic, its true, but as one of the heirs of the *libertinage érudit* of the first half of the century, he transmitted the culture of the skeptics La Mothe le Vayer and Gassendi to the later seventeenth century.<sup>58</sup> In 1674, Menage had written an amusing work, *Amoenitates juris civilis*, and as a result was viewed, along with Justel, by the young Wittenberg civil-lawyer Heber as a patron for a fashionably-academic, unpendantic view of jurisprudence.<sup>59</sup> As we have seen, Charles Ancillon stood quite near to this culture as well.

Antipedantism, criticism of authority, and skepticism were evidently those common ideals that had brought Heber into contact with the young Christian Thomasius, to whom in 1692–3 he had sent the announcement for his juristic lectures under the programmatic title *Scepticismus Juridicus Wittebergensis*.<sup>60</sup> In this announcement—and only for this reason do I come to speak of this—the influence on Heber by the debate about the *nouveaux pyrrhoniens* is clearly recognizable. Heber was interested in the hermeneutic problem of ambiguity<sup>61</sup> and uncer-

---

<sup>56</sup> This time span can be inferred from the fact that Heber was born in 1652; he probably began his peregrinatio academica around at the age of 25, after his university law studies, i.e. ca. 1677. The sources tell us about a “long” stay with Menage und Justel, as well as about stays in Holland and England. The time of Heber's return may be conjectured from his first publications as a professor in Wittenberg, which began in 1683.

<sup>57</sup> For Justel see Archives biographiques françaises 555, 447ff.

<sup>58</sup> On Menage: E. Samfiresco: Ménage polémiste, philologue, poète. Paris 1902; Lea Caminiti Pennarola: La correspondance Ménage-Huet, un dialogue à distance, in: Pierre Daniel Huet (1630–1721). Actes du colloque de Caen (12–13 nov. 1993), ed. Suzanne Guellouz. Seattle, Tübingen, PFSC 94 (= Biblio 17, n° 83), pp. 141–154. For the *Libertinage érudit* see the classical work by René Pintard: *Le Libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris 1943.

<sup>59</sup> Gilles Menage: *Amoenitates juris civilis*. Frankfurt und Leipzig 1680 (first edition 1668).

<sup>60</sup> Georg Michael Heber: *Scepticismus* (footnote 55).

<sup>61</sup> See Georg Michael Heber: *In ambiguarum legum interpretatione criterium veritatis non dari*. Wittenberg 1700.



tainty in legislative regulations, and particularly in the irreducible subjectivity which arises when conflicting parties refer to the same legislative text.<sup>62</sup> He pleads for restraint from judgement in these cases; that they—according to Heber’s idea—should be approached with the “isosthenia” of the ancient skeptics, wherein each side of an argument is given equal weight. However, Heber distanced himself from a radical epistemological skepticism in the style of the Jesuit François Veron, and instead put forward the moderate skepticism of the Huguenot Jean Daillé, who had emphasized, that logical conclusions are not the problem, but rather the choice of a starting point.<sup>63</sup> This starting point is always subjective, and determined through personal characteristics and preferences;<sup>64</sup> in his epistemology, Heber thus follows Gassendi.<sup>65</sup> Subjective viewpoints are ultimately based on decisions,

---

<sup>62</sup> Heber: *Scepticismus* (footnote 55), p. 132: “[...] cum pleraque erunt dicta, quae utrinque afferri possunt [...]”

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 128f.: “Quod idcirco fieri existimo, non quod Rationem fallacem hominum Magistram putem, aut quia interdum peccat, eo semper peccare cum Pyrrhoniis, a quibus hic seorsim sentio, existimem, sed quod Principia, quae a sola ratione exstruuntur, nunquam tam indubitata, comprehensa evidentiaque ac clare distincteque percepta esse intelligam, ut non formidinem oppositi perpetuum comitem habeant. Cum enim justa & injusta mente excipiantur, mente expendantur & dijudicentur, facile accidere potest, ut, quando quid vel ut verum assumitur, quod verum non est, vel ut liquidum & clarum, quod obscurum ac dubium erat, quod inde concluditur, vere quidem concludatur, & sic Ratio non peccet in argumentando, peccet tamen in ponendo principio & fundamento, unde ratiocinationes fluunt, sicut in Sacrae doctrinae genere Dallaeus acuratissime observavit.” See Jean Daillé: *La Foy fondée sur les Saintes Escritures: Contre les nouvelles methodistes*, 2nd ed. Charenton 1661; see Richard H. Popkin: *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Spinoza*. Berkeley 1979, p. 74.

<sup>64</sup> Apparently decisive for Heber in this point was the late 16th/early 17th century debate following Galen’s *Quod animi mores temperamentum corporis sequuntur*. Prominent in this debate were e.g. Huarte, Bodin, La Mothe Le Vayer and others.

<sup>65</sup> Heber: *Scepticismus* (footnote 55), pp. 129f.: “Non sum nescius, probabiliorem opinionem eam dici, quae maioris ponderis rationibus sustentatur, cum probabilis rationibus quidem & ipsa fulta sit, sed levioribus, & quae minus alte in animo insideant. Verum cum mille hominum ingeniorumque formae sint, & agitationes mentis temperamentum corporis sequantur; quae apud unum nullius ponderis videri poterat ratio, alteri apta nata est sub magna specie veritatis illudere; & vicissim, quae uni maximi momenti esse videtur, apud alium levissimo animu impulsu subire potest. Adeo nempe pugnant res probantur hominibus & placent, adeo pro varietate ingeniorum formae rerum diversimode capiuntur, ipsaque fundamenta & principia, quibus cetera tanquam fulcris, utut putribus atque ruinosis, incumbunt, aliter atque aliter pro animorum habitu ponuntur, ut ad summum dici possit, quid cuiquam bonum aut justum appareat, non vero quid secundum se & suapte natura ita se habet, ut verissime P. Gassendus tradidit.” See Pierre Gassendi: *Exercitationes*

and the stubborn confusion of these irrational decisions with the authority of objective truth was labeled by Heber with the same term that the contemporary Wittenberg theologians used, namely, ‘enthusiasm’.<sup>66</sup> However, the maxim of restraint from judgement in these cases was, according to Heber, only applicable for the judge, but not for the statesman, who has no time for hair-splitting, but rather is compelled to act.<sup>67</sup> In this way, Heber fended off the possible objections against his position as practical indifferent.

Here we see a radically tinged convergence with the early-Enlightenment thinkers in Halle, which followed in the footsteps of the French libertine-skeptical tradition, and exactly because of this is perceptible through the lens of the Berlin Refuge. Heber is no “Baylian”, as Oelven would have suspected, but rather a “Gassendian” or a “Menagian”, a student of that Menage, who, through La Monnoye’s *Menagiana* continuation of 1715–16, had almost become a fashionable author in Berlin,<sup>68</sup> Le Duchat, for instance, wrote numerous notes as supplementation and continuation of the *Menagiana*.<sup>69</sup> Barbeyrac’s conception of moral criticism was given life from Daillés description of the views of dogma of the church fathers. Daillés was

---

paradoxicæ adversus Aristoteles, Grenoble 1624. On Gassendi, see Olivier Bloch: *La philosophie de Gassendi*. Den Haag 1971; Tullio Gregory: *Scetticismo ed empirismo. Studio su Gassendi*. Bari 1961; Popkin (footnote 63), pp. 99ff.

<sup>66</sup> Heber: *Scepticismus* (footnote 55), p. 131: “Hic velim consideres; quam rem constituas Arbitrum Evidentiæ majoris, Motum Tuum, inclinationem, propensionem Animi Tui, uno verbo, ἐνθουσιάζσμον, hoc est, rem brutam, cujus rationem reddere nullam potes.” For the problem of enthusiasm, as seen from the viewpoint of the Wittenberg theologians, see e.g. Valentin Ernst Löscher: *Praenotiones theologicae*. Wittenberg 1713.

<sup>67</sup> Heber: *Scepticismus* (footnote 55), pp. 132f.: “Quod si quis calumniari hoc institutum voluerit & dicitare, sic incertos reddi adolescentum animos, & cum aliquando ad rempublicam in partibus gubernandum erunt admovendi, ignaros dubiosque fore, utrum in consulendo, respondendo aut judicando sequi debeant; eum nolim ignorare, aliud me tenere institutum, cum de veritate alicuius rei disceptatur, aliud, cum aliquid ad usum transferendum est. Illic omnem assensionem cohibeo, cum exploratum habeam, in Civilibus nihil pro aliqua sententia dici posse, cujus oppositum non speciosis rationibus defendi queat, cum earum ea indoles sit, ut claram distinctamque perceptionem, quæ uniuscujusque intellectum constringat, non admittat. Hic vero & ipse perpenso totius negotii, de quo judicandum in praesentia est, complexu, omnibusque, quæ illud circumstant, quanta necesse est, diligentia ac studio consideratis, Motum animi mei Judicem facio; ratus, ut rem acu maxime non tangam, propterea Graeciae salutem in discrimen haud venturam.”

<sup>68</sup> *Menagiana*, ou les bons mots, les pensées critiques, historiques, morales et d’Erudition de Monsieur Ménage, recueillies par ses amies. 4 vols. Paris 1715.

<sup>69</sup> See Ducatiana (footnote 38).

by no means a libertine, but he portrayed these views as subjective opinions, which flowed from their moral dispositions.<sup>70</sup>

What might ‘juridical skepticism’ mean? When a judge is a skeptic, and—once more with the words of Oelven—relativizes each testimony with a “*videtur*” (“it appears so”), then the presumption of innocence comes into force.<sup>71</sup> In *Symbolum sapientiae*, the author argues that the “*praesumptio*” should be made of the atheist’s side in the quarrel over the existence of God. As long as God (analogous to guilt!) is not proved, then one must start from his non-existence.<sup>72</sup> Therefore, Oelven was completely correct when he saw that the *libertinage érudit* (though certainly with powerful help from Hobbes and Spinoza) could lead into atheism.

My portrayal of the Wittenberg “border” of the Refuge, looking to Catholic France, as seen from the viewpoint of the Calvinist Refuge, might be a risqué construction. At any rate, the Berlin anti-skepticism from the middle of the century offers something new to consider when seen from this perspective.<sup>73</sup>

What’s more, there were ‘Clandestine margins’ which were geographically closer to Berlin than Wittenberg, and which had direct contacts with the Refuge. One example is Königswalde, where Samuel Crell looked after a small Socinian congregation. Crell, attracted by a tolerance he discovered by reading between the lines in La Croze’s 1707 *Dissertations*, came to Berlin to converse with La Croze.<sup>74</sup> It was Ancillon, by the way, who had originally arranged for Crell to come from Holland to Prussia.<sup>75</sup> A former student of La Croze was similarly lured by the *Entretiens* of 1711, in which La Croze had put a good word in, not for the Socinians but for the Jews, and the man

---

<sup>70</sup> Jean Daillé: De usu patrum (footnote 7).

<sup>71</sup> On the problem of juridical argumentation in early modern Europe see e.g. Mathias Schmöckel: *Humanität und Staatsraison. Die Abschaffung der Folter in Europa und die Entwicklung des gemeinen Strafprozeß- und Beweisrechts seit dem hohen Mittelalter*. Köln 2000.

<sup>72</sup> See the important work by Winfried Schröder: *Ursprünge des Atheismus. Untersuchungen zur Metaphysik- und Religionskritik des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart 1998, pp. 372ff.

<sup>73</sup> See John Christian Laursen: *Swiss anti-skeptics in Berlin*, in: *Die Schweizer in Berlin*, ed. Helmut Holzhey and Martin Fontius. Berlin 1996; Sandra Pott: *Reformierte Morallehren* (footnote 44).

<sup>74</sup> See Mulsow: *Die drei Ringe* (footnote 12), pp. 75ff.

<sup>75</sup> See Friedrich Bock: *Historia Antitrinitariorum maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum*. vol. I/1. Leipzig 1774, pp. 161–203.

who came to visit La Croze was a Frenchman who had converted to Judaism.<sup>76</sup>

All such movements were better accomplished secretly, and La Croze therefore carefully destroyed the letters from the Jew. One clearly sees, however, that it didn't have to be radical skepticism to open the doors to the *marges*, but merely a *culture érudite* which had moved towards tolerance.<sup>77</sup> The basis for this was quite simple: the maxim of impartiality, then, when a morally acceptable posture was seen, led necessarily to a respect for, and a portrayal of, even heterodox positions. I cannot here explain what discretionary spaces emerged, but I can point to the keywords of Antitrinitarianism and Spinozism.<sup>78</sup> These spaces materialized in the radicalization of such already liberal positions in matters of dogmatics.

In this context, I would like to recall that the dissent which exists between Winfried Schröder and Detlef Döring over the Berlin radical Friedrich Wilhelm Stosch, has not yet been resolved. Schröder describes Stosch's *Concordia* from 1692 as clearly Spinozistic, while Döring places the accent on a radicalized rationalistic-Arminian position like that of Le Clerc's, picked up on by the Reformed milieu of Berlin and Frankfurt an der Oder.<sup>79</sup> According to his opinion, the high-ranking commission which condemned Stosch was only so picky because the intentions of the *Concordia* furnished ideas which had then been disavowed, ideas which the commission members, in part, shared.

---

<sup>76</sup> See Mulsow: Die drei Ringe (footnote 12), pp. 68ff. In greater detail in idem: Cartesianism, Scepticism and Conversion to Judaism: The Case of Aaron d'Antan, in: Secret Conversions to Judaism in Early Modern Europe, ed. Martin Mulsow and Richard H. Popkin (forthcoming).

<sup>77</sup> In the difficult matters of the history of the Jews and the history of atheism, La Croze has examined very accurately, if the philological and textual foundations for these histories have been sufficient; thus he reacted very sharply to errors in Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs*. These questions were in his view more important than dogmatic ones, because he held that dogmatic questions should not be essential for the church historian. See [La Croze:] *Entretiens sur divers sujets d'histoire, de littérature, de religion et de critique*. Cologne [Amsterdam] 1711; his history of atheism is in part IV of the *Entretiens*.

<sup>78</sup> See Mulsow: *Moderne aus dem Untergrund* (footnote 54).

<sup>79</sup> See Winfried Schröder: *Einleitung*, in: Friedrich Wilhelm Stosch: *Concordia rationis et fidei* (1692); *Dokumente*, ed. Winfried Schröder. Stuttgart 1992, pp. 7–29; Detlef Döring: *Frühaufklärung und obrigkeitliche Zensur in Brandenburg. Friedrich Wilhelm Stosch und das Verfahren gegen sein Buch 'Concordia rationis et fidei'*. Berlin 1995.

La Croze might have been the clearest example of someone who was led into the Clandestine world through his scholarly, unbiased ethos;<sup>80</sup> but Lenfant also took pride, for example, in his *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, especially of his account of the Jewish-Christian religious dialogues of Tortosa in 1413–4.<sup>81</sup> There, he devoted a surprising number of pages, and gave a great deal of respect, to the arguments of the Jews. La Croze, therefore, was no isolated case.

Whoever is doubtful of this radicalizing dynamics of impartial scholarship, needs only look at its reception. The Marquis d'Argens was enthusiastic about La Croze's histories of Christianity in India and Armenia,<sup>82</sup> and Voltaire,<sup>83</sup> as well as Gibbon, were attentive readers of Beausobre's way of writing history of dogma, with the view of the "religion la plus pure, que la Raison Humaine ait jamais imaginée."<sup>84</sup> John Pocock could tell us a lot about the reception of Beausobre as far as Gibbon is concerned.<sup>85</sup> With Gibbon, church history (on the basis of Huguenot accounts) becomes the key to understanding how the decline of the Roman Empire sewed the barbarian seeds of the new Europe.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> An instance of direct reverse impact from the clandestine milieu on the Berlin Refuge can probably be seen in the influence of Johann Georg Wachter's *Spinozismus im Judenthumb* on Beausobre's *Histoire critique* (footnote 18). Beausobre grounds his history of Manicheism on Wachter's thesis of a presence of 'spinozistic' thinking even in the Jewish Kabbalah. He says that there have been from the beginning two currents of thought, a dualistic and a monistic (later represented by Spinoza), and that the latter could be found already in the Jewish Kabbalists, who he thought had lived in the times of the Old Testament. One has to admit, however, that 'Spinozismus im Judenthumb', Wachter's first work, was not yet clandestine and radical, but still written in an antispinozistic tone.

<sup>81</sup> Lenfant: *Histoire du Concil de Pise* (footnote 9), vol. 2, pp. 140–170; see also vol. 1, Preface, p. LIII. For the religious dialogue of Tortosa see *Kirche und Synagoge*, ed. Karl Heinrich von Rengstorff and Siegfried von Kortzfleisch. München 1988, vol. 1, pp. 240–245.

<sup>82</sup> See Steve Larkin: *Correspondence entre Prosper Marchand et le marquis d'Argens*. Oxford 1984, p. 109 and elsewhere.

<sup>83</sup> See Betram Schwarzbach: *Voltaire et les huguenots de Berlin: Formey et Isaac de Beausobre*, in: *Voltaire und Deutschland*, ed. Desne, Brockmeier and Voss. Stutzgart 1979, pp. 103–118.

<sup>84</sup> Beausobre: *Histoire critique* (footnote 18), vol. 1, p. 161.

<sup>85</sup> One can expect this of the announced third volume of Pocock's 'Barbarism and Religion'. See meanwhile his: *Gibbon and the History of Heresy*, in: *Histories of Heresy*, ed. Laursen (footnote 3), pp. 205–220.

<sup>86</sup> See John G. A. Pocock: *Barbarism and Religion. Volume I: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon 1737–1764*. Cambridge 1999, Introduction.

I do not want to go as far as Derrida, and, in his style of dialectical capriole, now make the back side of the Refuge to the true front, and the edges the center; Beausobre was not Voltaire and La Croze was not Lessing. However, I would like to plead for a many-dimensional view of the Berlin Refuge. Research on networks and clandestine literature should not be isolated areas of specialized scholarship, but be used to deepen the account of the history of ideas. Scholarly projects, theological positions and theories of natural law can always also be seen in relation to ‘impolite learning’; and here I explicitly include the tendency towards heterodoxy under the term ‘impolite’. These views can teach us how the spirit out of which these projects come into being contained the potential for transcending the acknowledged and practiced mentalities. John Christian Laursen has rightly emphasized that in the production of Clandestine texts in the Refuge, as forerunners to the great liberal ideas, authors proceeded in the direction “from practice to theory”, as shown by the movement from nicodemism (as practised in France) to the theory of the permissible lie, or by that from the common perception of the political function of religion to a theory of religious imposture.<sup>87</sup> This fact also shows the precarious and seldomly perceived unity of “unofficial” practices, radical outlines, and scholarly reflections.

I envision a future constellation analysis of the Berlin Refuge to work along these lines.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> John Christian Laursen: *Impostors and Liars: Clandestine Manuscripts and the Limits of Freedom of the Press in the Huguenot Netherlands*, in: *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. idem. Leiden 1995, pp. 73–108; esp. pp. 96ff.

<sup>88</sup> I am grateful to Christopher Lundgren for his help in translating this text from German.

II

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

This page intentionally left blank



EZECHIEL SPANHEIM'S DISPUTE WITH RICHARD SIMON:  
ON THE BIBLICAL PHILOLOGY AT THE END  
OF THE 17TH CENTURY

Lutz Danneberg

1

In the main part of this article, I will try to clarify the theological hermeneutical dispute between Spanheim and Richard Simon (1638–1712), one of the most distinguished biblical scholars at the end of the 17th century. I will illustrate this by setting up a historical and theoretical context. However, the dispute is not the main reason why we remember Spanheim. We remember him as a more or less successful diplomat and as someone who cultivated numerous relations with the *res publica litteraria et christiana* of his time. He is still revered today as one of the fathers of modern numismatology. In addition to his important publications, he is said to have founded the first numismatic society in London in 1710.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, we know the Spanheim Society, largely for the important role it played for the foundation of the academy. Spanheim is also remembered as the person in charge of the scientific field at this academy, as friend and benefactor of the Frenchmen who had to flee their country because of their faith.<sup>2</sup>

Ezechiel was at least the fourth generation of a family of scholars. Apart from some *Orationes* and occasional poetry on high-ranking personalities, his grandfather Wigand Spanheim seems to have made himself a name with his *Commentarius analyticus & erotematicus in Orationem*

---

<sup>1</sup> For his biography, still cf. Victor Loewe: Ein Diplomat und Gelehrter: Ezechiel Spanheim (1629–1710). With appendix: Aus dem Briefwechsel zwischen Spanheim und Leibniz. Berlin 1924, and, *ibid.*: Ein Diplomat und Gelehrter des 17. Jahrhunderts. Ezechiel Spanheim in pfälzischen Diensten, in: Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins NF 29, pp. 235–265.

<sup>2</sup> Stefan Lorenz: Ezechiel Spanheim und das höhere Bildungswesen in Brandenburg-Preußen um 1700, in: Brandenburg-Preußen und das Jahrhundert der Aufklärung, ed. Günter Lottes. Berlin 2002, pp. 85–137 contains lots of further information on Spanheim's life.

*Ciceronis* (1591) only.<sup>3</sup> As the title reveals, this writing was a revision of speeches by Cicero to make them applicable for teaching at schools. Certainly the work would not have been any good to lay the foundations for the career of his son Friedrich, Ezechieel's father. However, it is safe to say that the work of his grandfather, Daniel Tossanus (1541–1602) made a deeper impression on him. Tossanus was a well-known reformed theologian, who taught in Heidelberg.<sup>4</sup> His grandson, Friedrich Spanheim the Elder (1600–1649) was one of the most promising scholars of reformed orthodoxy when he was called to the University of Leiden in 1642. At first he studied in Heidelberg, then in Geneva, where he received a professorship for philosophy in 1626 and later also for theology. At the time that he left for the Netherlands, 25 years had passed since the Reformed Christians had faced their biggest challenge, which they overcame by the exclusion of the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort (1618/19).

The conflicting views were thereby not harmonised, however their intellectual collectivity would have been quite solid, had the argument about *la nouvelle théologie* of the French-Reformed academy of Saumur not risen. These arguments were by no means less intensive than the ones with the Remonstrants. Eventually, the most powerful non-theological weapon was used: a boycott, which was joined by both Dutch universities and the University of Geneva. But in contrast to the resolutions passed in Dort, this resolution did not lead to an intra-denominational exclusion of the *nova dogmata, nova vocabula* and *novas distinctiones*, when the argument culminated in 1650.

Although numerous theologians were involved in the argument—the opposing side including pundits such as Petrus Molinaeus (Pierre du Moulin, 1568–1658), the favouring side Johannes Dallaeus (Daillé, 1594–1670), who was no less influential—it was Ezechieel's father who played a leading role in the escalation of the quarrel with a—even in the eyes of his contemporaries—very voluminous controversial writing, the *Exercitationes de gratia universali* of 1646, which was easily ten times as long as the criticised text. The crucial point of the new theology by Moise Amyraut (Amyraldus, 1596–1644) consisted of his view on the doctrines of predestination and grace also

---

<sup>3</sup> Spanheim, *Commentarius analyticus & eroteticus in Orationem Ciceronis* [...]. Lipsiae 1591.

<sup>4</sup> For him still cf. Friedrich W. Cuno: *Daniel Tossanus der Ältere, Professor der Theologie und Pastor*. 2 vols., Amsterdam 1898.

known as *universalismus hypotheticus*. He moderated the traditional formulation, claiming that initially God's initial will was the salvation of *all* human beings (and not the salvation of just a part, i.e. a selective salvation), if only they *believed*. But God knows in advance, who will find the true faith. Also, God could have, if he had wanted to, condemned even an 'innocent' person because of his *potentia absoluta*, without therefore causing conflicts with his other divine attributes. But he did not do it and did not want to do it, Amyraut said. That is why we have to ask a different question. Now it dealt with people: some of them found the faith, others did not. Not only did this allow to reflect on questions of Christian ethics—Amyraut would do this in an extensive way in his unending work *La Morale chrétienne*; this conception also offered the chance to create a union between Reformed Christians and the Lutherans, since, apart from the Christological conception of the *communicatio idiomatum* and the doctrine on ubiquity and the presence of Christ at the Communion, it is just the very same strict conception of the predestination that seemed to be theologically unacceptable to the Lutherans.

The attacks on the new theology reached their climax when their members were accused of following Arminianism, i.e. the cancellation of the consensus reached at the Synod of Dort. In the language of that time this is equivalent to demanding a synod regulation. In retrospect it may sound impious, but we can assume that Ezechiel's father—indirectly—also helped settling the argument quickly, namely with his premature death in 1649.<sup>5</sup> His even more voluminous but

---

<sup>5</sup> At one of the Spanheim conferences, Ezechiel speaks about the case history of the arguments about the idea of an universal grace and also mentions at this occasion that his father had helped publish the work of John Cameron (1579–1625) in Geneva, cf. Johannes Kvačala: Die Spanheim-Conferenz in Berlin, in: Monatshefte der Comenius-Gesellschaft 9 (1900), pp. 22–43, here p. 35. They speak about Cameron: Τὰ Εωζόμενα Sive opera partim ab auctor ipso edita [. . .]. Genevae & Francofurti 1642. Cameron is one of the providers of new ideas for Amyraut and other French Reformed Christians. From the mid 17th century on it was assumed that Friedrich Spanheim himself had published this work. We do not find any hints confirming this, neither in the text nor in the discussions held in the "Vénéable Compagnie" in Geneva. Also cf. François Laplanche: Orthodoxie et Prédication. L'œuvre d'Amyraut et la querelle de la grâce universelle. Paris 1965, Axel Hilmar Swinne: John Cameron—Philosoph und Theologe (1579–1625). Marburg 1968, pp. 88–91. But this does not exclude the weaker statement by Spanheim, who names Alexander Morus (1616–1670) as the opponent. Alexander Morus, however was under the suspicion of sympathising with Saumur's theology. The thèses of 1649 were against Morus, see Donald D. Grohman: The Genevan Reactions to the Saumur Doctrine of Hypothetical Universalism: 1635–1685. Ph.D. Dissertation, Knox College,

unfinished response to Amyraut's remarks was published by his son Ezechiel. He himself stood out to defend his father with a *Disquisitio critica contra Amyraldum* and remarks on 'grammatical stupidities'.<sup>6</sup>

In 1650 and at least for the time being, the reformed orthodoxy did not come up with a definite public decision on the controversies about the *prédestination universelle ou conditionnelle*. In the middle of the 17th century, Saumur became the symbol of this new theology with the help of Amyraut, Ludovicus Capellus (Louis Cappelle, 1585–1658) and Josua de la Place (Placeus, 1596–1655). The reformed orthodoxy considered this new theology a threat.<sup>7</sup> A quarter of a century later this was formally expressed; not in a new Synod of Dort though, but in the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* of 1675. In this document, the first three *canones* are directed against Cappell, the fourth to the ninth and the thirteenth to the twenty-second against Amyraut, the tenth to the twelfth against La Place; but, in contrast to initial intentions, neither against Cocceian theology nor against Cartesian philosophy. As early as 1686, it was abolished for the Reformed Christians in Brandenburg and basically lost its importance in Switzerland in the 1720's.

But the first impression of the theological commitment was deceiving, because more than Ezechiel himself, his younger brother, christened by his father's name Friedrich (1631–1710), followed in his father's theological footsteps. He was only 23 years old when he received a chair in Theology at the University of Heidelberg and returned to his father's place of activities in the year 1670. His father was already confronted with the 'Cartesian crisis' when he was in Leiden. But being the Rector of the University, he seemed to have

---

Toronto 1971, p. 232. Laplanche and Swinne were apparently ignorant of these remarks by Spanheim.

<sup>6</sup> Cf.: Friderici Spanhemi vinidicarvm pro exercitationibvs suis, de gratia vniversalis, partes duae posthumae, aduersus specimen animadversionvm Mosis Amyraldi. Cum praefatione Andreae Riveti, Accessit appendix Ezechielis Spanhemii Frid. Fil. Ad critice Salmuriensem, & grammaticas tricas. Amstelodami 1649.

<sup>7</sup> Their common ideas are expressed in a mighty collection of disputes. Cf. Ludovicus Cappellus: Moyse Amyraut und Josua de la Place: Theses Theologicae in Academia Salmavriensi variis temporibvs disvtate [...]. Pars prior. Salmvri 1641; pars secunda 1645, pars tertia et ultima 1651. In effect, this collection aims at the substitution of the orthodox codification by Johannes Polyander (1558–1646), Andreas Rivetus (1587–1651), Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639) and Antonius Thysius (1565–1640), which was published in the form of 50 disputations, the Synopsis puriores, in the year 1625.

played a rather harmonising role. The curators of the University followed his advice and prohibited both the positive and the negative discussions about Cartesian topics; but they were not successful. In 1656, a virtual peace treaty could be concluded between philosophy and theology, mainly due to the intervention of Abraham Heidanus (1597–1678), an advocate of the *theologia cartesiana*. This agreement set limits to philosophy in the field of the truths of the Revelations, but it tried to protect both sides with their individual rights. Heidanus said that theology was to be confined to the Holy Scriptures and had to be free of any philosophy, whereas philosophy was to deal with (natural) philosophical truths. This concept was complemented by the idea that theology was a practical discipline, whereas philosophy was a theoretical one. Therefore, this formed one of the foundations for the spectacular connection between the Cartesian philosophy and the Cocceian theology, the latter considering itself as a theology freed from Aristotelian philosophemes and therefore limiting itself in the emphatic sense to the Bible. Philosophy on the other hand was not Christian in so far as it did not base its claims of knowledge on the Holy Scriptures; but still it was able—following the Cartesian thinking—to prove the prerequisites of Christian theology, e.g. the existence of God and the immortality of the soul.

At first glance, this separation into different sectors may have seemed quite elegant. But with it came the danger that the paramount Christian manifestation, i.e. the Holy Scriptures, was cut into two parts of unequal value. This was something that—simultaneously to the thought of a divine accommodation, a view taken from patrology—received a theoretical justification, which had been subject to discussions for a long time.<sup>8</sup> Heidanus, who by the way gave the *Oratio funebris* at Spanheim's funeral<sup>9</sup> owed his influence to a great extent to his family-like relations to the leader of the 'sovereign's party' Johan de Witt. With the party being deprived of its political rights in 1672, the pressure of those against a *theologia cartesiana* grew. Friedrich Spanheim Jr was one of those who played a leading role

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Lutz Danneberg: Schleiermacher und das Ende des Akkommodationsgedankens in der hermeneutica sacra des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts, in: 200 Jahre "Reden über die Religion", ed. Ulrich Barth und Claus-Dieter Osthövener. Berlin, New York 2000, pp. 194–246.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Heidanus: *Oratio funebris* on obitum reverendi celeberrimique theologi Friderici Spanhemii [. . .] unacum epicediis varior [. . .]. Lugduni Batavorum 1649.

in these quarrels. As early as 1673 it came to a row with Theodor Craanen (1635–1688), who only shortly before was offered the chair in Philosophy. As a result, he was transferred to the Faculty of Medicine. At the end of his career, Craanen was the personal physician of the Elector of Brandenburg.

Spanheim and Antonius Hulsius (1615–1685)—who was first a professor of Hebrew and therefore was committed to one of the central topics of his time, the *Authentica absoluta* of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament,<sup>10</sup> and who was later professor of Theology—prepared the prohibition of 21 theses, which spoke against the declarations of the national Synod of Dort and which—after the consent of William III—were posted at the entrance doors of the University.<sup>11</sup> The first seven statements were in the narrower sense theological, directed against Cocceian theology. The remaining ones were philosophical and were mainly directed against the Cartesian philosophemes. It would not be true to say that these two theologians had not carried out their task diligently. As opposed to many other prohibitions of a similar kind, these incriminated theses, especially the philosophical ones, did not only offer a summary of preceding discussions, but they were chosen with care and consideration. Looking at what they left out, offers an exciting insight into the status of philosophical acceptance. There is, for example, not one single word about the conflicts with the Aristotelian idea of the *forma substantialis*. Furthermore, the incriminating phrases demonstrated that the reactions were not only sparked by changes in the political scene, but also to the persistence of the problems. Therefore it seemed quite wise—as it was the case with Pierre Bayle and Gottfried Arnold—to refer to this quarrel by using the writings of Friedrich Spanheim and Antonius Hulsius, who were both doubtlessly biased.

The last of the 21 incriminating utterances—*Philosophia scripturae sacrae interpretis*—expresses a point the first generation Cartesians were reproached of, but which only the second generation envisaged. Namely not just to reduce the Holy Scriptures into its component parts, but to view it *in its entirety*. And this topic was the title of a writing that was considered—also by the early Cartesians—to be at

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Hulsius: *Authentia Absoluta S. Textus Hebraei Vindicata Contra Criminationes Cl. Viri Isaaci Vossii* [. . .]. Roterodami 1662.

<sup>11</sup> Printed in P. C. Mollhysen: *Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis der leidsche Universiteits*. III. Deel, The Hague 1918, pp. 317/8.

least as horrific as Spinoza's *Tractatus*. Kant would take this idea up more than a hundred years later. Shortly before that, Johann Salomo Semler (1725–1791) had published the text by Lodewijk Meyer (1629–1681), still maintaining his anonymity, and had doubled its size by adding scholarly annotations. But now the interpreting force of these writings was no longer the Cartesian, but the Practical Reason of the *interpretatio authentica* of the Holy Scriptures.<sup>12</sup> This was an idea that numerous theologians accepted emphatically. This acceptance continued until people realised that this concept did not at all declare the Holy Scripture as an authoritative testimony and Christianity as a 'positive' religion. This idea was merely acceptable to all religious and non-religious texts. But it was well known, that as a theologian you were not looking for shelter among the classical philologists or the philosophers.

## 2

Having mentioned this, I have reached the topic of hermeneutics, and I would like to begin by coming back to Ezechiel Spanheim. He was born in Geneva in 1629. His mother and grandmother were of French origin and thus French was probably more to him than just a *lingua franca*.<sup>13</sup> At the age of 13 he enrolled at the University of Leiden, following his father. Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638), the great encyclopaedist, Johannes Buxtorf (1599–1664), the important son of the even more important Hebrew scholar of the same name, John Wilkins (1614–1672), the outstanding figure of the early *Royal Society* (to which Ezechiel was admitted in 1678), Jakob Alting (1618–1676), the eminent expert on the old language, who at the age of 25 became the successor of the opponent of the Remonstrant Franciscus Gomarus (1563–1600)—they all enrolled at a University at the age of 13. David Chytraeus (Kochhafen, 1530–1600) received his master's degree when he was 14. He was able to convince sceptical Melanchthon during the entrance conversation in Wittenberg

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Lutz Danneberg: *Besserverstehen: Zur Analyse und Entstehung einer hermeneutischen Maxime*, in: *Regeln der Bedeutung*, ed. Fotis Jannides et al. Berlin, New York 2003.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Adolf von den Velden: *Über die hugenottische Abkunft des Freiherrn Ezechiel von Spanheim*, in: *Die französische Kolonie* 7 (1893), pp. 184–188.

with the Latin translation of a randomly picked page from the *History of the Peloponnesian War* by Thucydides. A century later still, Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766) enrolled at the age of 14. An outstanding career was in store for all of them. The same was true for the even more outstanding Johann Heinrich Dauber (1610–1672). On receiving his degree in his eleventh year, i.e. in 1621, he defended a Hebrew dissertation at the renowned *Hohe Schule* (academy) in Herborn, where his father gave lectures in philosophy. On the top of that, he had knowledge of the Syriac, Chaldean and Arabic languages.

The fact that Ezechiel was so young when he enrolled was on the one hand a sign of a certain intellectual precocity, but it also gave proof to the commitment of his father, especially in the field of the knowledge of foreign languages, but not really of anything else.<sup>14</sup> The old languages were his strong point, which was also recognised by the two authorities at the University of Leiden, Claudius Salmasius (Saumaise, 1588–1653) and Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655), whose son Nicolaas (1620–1681) was a good friend of Ezechiel. He was just 16 when he led a discussion on a highly controversial subject concerning the antique languages. Of course such a subject could in those days only be a highly controversial subject if it contained theological aspects. At the age of 21, Ezechiel received a chair of Eloquence at the University of Geneva—which by then had had its day, to be sure—where stayed to teach for five years. This was the last time he worked at a university. In 1655 he was the educator for the electoral prince at the Court of Heidelberg. There he met his younger brother, who helped rebuild the ailing university. Since at that time there was no real civil service to speak of, Spanheim could fulfil various diplomatic missions and serve several masters. His biographer gave testimony to the fact that Ezechiel possessed a

---

<sup>14</sup> Reuchlin started his Universal career in Tübingen in the year 1470 at the tender age of 15. John Cheke and Thomas Smith enrolled in 1625 at the age of 12 at the University of Cambridge. The two of them were friends with Roger Aschams (1515–1568), who registered at the age of 14 or 15. With respect to the classes of the Preparatory Academy for Artists, early enrolments of that kind were apparently not that unusual. In admitting such young students, universities seemed quite similar to the outstanding grammar schools. Classes here were similar to the first three years at university, but they did not have the right to award doctorate degrees. At the beginning of the 16th century, the tendency to put students in hostels for their young age (“Bursenzwang”) seems to have increased in order to make sure they lived an irreproachable life. By enrolling at a university, students also became university citizens, and the university was held responsible if someone violated a law of that specific town.



deep and great learning, but also sophisticated and discreet tactfulness. There does not seem to be a reason to doubt of either of these faculties. For reasons that we cannot trace back anymore, he went to Italy in 1661. There he participated, among other things, in activities organised by the convert and abdicated Swedish queen Christine, who held court there, and made numerous acquaintances. The weekly meeting of scholars may have become a role model for the Spanheim conferences of later times.

Above all, one intellectual passion was fostered in this time: the numerous numismatic collections offer the empiric foundation for his main work on this subject: *Dissertationes de praestantia et usu numismaticum antiquorum*, which was published in Rome in 1664, edited various times thereafter and in 1717 completed by writings found in his intellectual inheritance.<sup>15</sup> The second dissertation in particular did not only underline the important role of coins with inscriptions on it to determine the age of texts; it also showed what eminent theological questions were connected with this matter: it dealt with the determination of the age of the 'Samaritan letters'.<sup>16</sup> To put it simply: it expresses the hope to limit the historical or *hermeneutical Pyrrhonism* by means of such non-literary sources. The ideas of the Jesuit Jean Hardouin (1646–1729)—a remarkable scholar, the contentious chronologist, professor of theology and librarian of the Jesuit Collège Louis-le-Grand—were notorious. Hardouin took upon himself the charge of refuting modern atheists, among whom he counted Descartes, Malebranche and Arnauld. He said that 500 years earlier in France, a syndicate of frauds had counterfeited almost all Greek and Latin authors and he held that not only was all the Patristic literature fraudulent, but that it and the monuments of Church History were all forged by monks. These monks invented an ecclesiastical history and included heresies and schisms as well as a complementary secular history, and they were also specialists at forging ancient medals

---

<sup>15</sup> Spanheim: *Vsu numismaticum antiquorum* [1664] Editio noua. In quae editae antea *Dissertationes* recensentur, mutisque accessionibus locupletantur [. . .]. Tomus primus. Londini 1706. This work contained the original nine dissertations which had been previously published in two volumes. The second volume, published with delay, was edited by Isaak Verburg (1685–after 1744), who explained the delay in the foreword and complained various times about the poor condition of the bequeathed manuscripts, contained four new dissertations, cf. *ibid.*: *Vsu Numismatum antiquorum*, Volumen alterum [. . .]. Amstelaedami 1717.

<sup>16</sup> Vgl. Spanheim: *Vsu Numismatum antiquorum*, Diss. II, pp. 59–130.

and coins. On the basis of the coins found, he started the *Chronologiae ex nummis antiquae restitutae* at the end of the 17th century.<sup>17</sup> This, namely the historical or hermeneutical Pyrrhonism, was therefore the starting point for Spanheim's hermeneutical theological interventions.<sup>18</sup> His brother took also part in the discussions on this subject. For example, he played an important role in a *disputatio* with Jean-Alphonse Turretini (1671–1737), in which the protestant criticism of the centralistic concept in the Catholic Church and its idea on authority is highlighted in a way that the pontifical magisterium's unfulfilled claim of infallibility was identified as *pyrrhonismus*, as *pyrrhonismus pontificus*.<sup>19</sup> This subsumption to Pyrrhonism caused such strong feelings of resentment (almost as strong as against atheism) among the Protestants of that time that we can speak of a *reductio ad absurdum*.

It seems as if large parts of his inheritance were lost. Therefore, only very little is known about Ezechiel's impressions of and in Rome. We can assume that his biographer were right in saying that the very close contact with the Roman Church did not influence his protestant convictions. After the year 1660, due to his palatine services, Spanheim went to Paris and other central places of political events in a troublesome time. After this comparatively tranquil period, a political mission and family affairs brought him to England in 1675. In 1678 he stayed in the Netherlands and accepted a position at the Court of Brandenburg. By the end of the year he was back in England. As an envoy of Brandenburg, he lived and worked

---

<sup>17</sup> An allusion might be found in Spanheim: *Lettre à un Ami, Où l'on rend compte d'un Livre, qui a pour titre, Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* [...], in: Simon: *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* [... 1678]. Nouvelle Edition, & qui est la première imprimée sur la Copie de Paris, augmentée d'une Apologie générale & de plusieurs Remarques Critiques [...]. Rotterdam 1685, pp. 563–622 (p. 575): “un autre Critique Français” with respect to Aristotle and Livy.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Simon: *Lettre choisies* [...]. Tom. IV. Paris 1739: “Le P. Hardouin, qui est de mes amis, et qui est fort obligé.”

<sup>19</sup> Cf.: *Pyrrhonimus Pontificius sive Theses Theologico-Historicae de Variationibus Pontificorum circa Ecclesiae Infallibilitatem Pars Prior* [... pars posterior]. Quam [...] sub Praesidio [...] Friderici Spanhemii [...] Publicè ventilandam proponit Joh. Alphonsus Turretinus [...]. Lugduni Batavorum 1692. The proof of authorship lies in the inclusion of this text into Turretini's collection: *Cogitationes et Dissertationes Theologicae*. On Turretini's attempts to reunite the Swiss Reformed Church, the Prussian Lutherans, the Prussian Calvinists and the Church of England, see Marvion I. Klauber, *The Context and Development of the Views of Jean-Alphonse Turretini (1671–1737) on Religious Authority*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison 1987.

for some time in Paris. He stayed there for nine years, except for occasional interruptions. This time came to an end with the death of the Great Elector and a changed world. In Paris, Spanheim had not only cultivated friendships, for example with Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630–1721), who was highly esteemed by Leibniz, but he continued with numismatic studies and the exchange of ideas with other scholars. The most important event during his stay, though, was the abolition of the Edict of Nantes. As late as 1681, he was committed to help his brothers in faith in Paris. This led to various diplomatic complications, and obviously he was succeeded in making public the Brandenburg reaction, i.e. the Edict of Potsdam from 8 November 1685. Agreeing to a request to document his knowledge of the Court of Paris—*Relation de la cour de France*—created a historical source, which provided him with late honours in French historiography.

Between the years 1690 and 1697 he stayed in Berlin. Due to instructions from authorities, Spanheim devoted much of his attention to the French *réfugiés*. He was substantially involved in the founding of the *Collège français*. I cannot go into detail about his numerous activities in this context, as far as they are still tangible today.<sup>20</sup> I would just like to point out the Spanheim conferences I already mentioned. Daniel Ernst Jablonski (1660–1741), preacher at Court and grandson of Comenius kept a ‘diarium’ on the rare occasions when he took part in these conferences.<sup>21</sup> Although this source was very valuable, we know little so far about the participants and the topics discussed. The first of his entries, for example, was: “five French preachers and twice as many politici”.<sup>22</sup> Jablonski wrote almost only about theological subjects, and particularly about those that dealt with interdenominational questions. It would be an exciting task to decipher the very rare hints that he gave us. In this diary, we find for instance a certain “Dr. Grabe”, whom he mentioned three times. Except for Spanheim, no other participant was mentioned so often.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Stefan Lorenz: Ezechiel Spanheim (footnote 2).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Kvačala: Die Spanheim-Conferenz (footnote 5), sowie Ferdinand Petri: Die Spanheimgesellschaft in Berlin. 1689–1697, in: Das königliche Wilhelmsgymnasium in den Jahren 1858 bis 1908, ed. Emil Schmiele, Berlin 1908, pp. 123–142.

<sup>22</sup> Some hints in Ines Boeger: Der Spanheim-Kreis und seine Bedeutung für Leibniz’ Akademiepläne, in: Hans Poser and Albert Heinekamp (ed.), Leibniz and Berlin. Stuttgart 1990, pp. 202–217.

<sup>23</sup> In Boeger, as above, we do not find any hints about this topic.

If this person really was Johann Ernst Grabe (1666–1711)—and there is quite some evidence that it was him—, then this would add another aspect to the conference.

Theologically speaking, Grabe was a syncretist and was considering a change to Catholicism. One year before his attendances at the Spanheim conference, theologians sternly reprimanded him for this stance. Full of despair, he turned to Philipp Jakob Spener (1635–1705) in Berlin. In 1597 he was in England, where he lived as an important patristic researcher and expert on biblical questions.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, he devoted much of his time to the reconstruction of the Septuagint by means of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, which was kept in England. This *Codex* also played a role in the arguments between Spanheim and Simon.<sup>25</sup> Quite obviously, he did not only introduce Jablonski to the Spanheim conferences, but also provided him with employment in England, also having the Anglican Church in mind, where Grabe's interest in patristics found a good resort. Grabe became a member of the Anglican Church and kept conducting correspondence with Jablonski, who obviously considered the Anglican Church to be a model for that in Brandenburg. In their discussions, Spanheim spoke also about Simon's ideas that the Anglican Church was closer to the Roman Church than any other protestant one.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> For an example cf. Grabe: *De Forma consecrationis eucharisticae, s. Defensio ecclesiae Graeca contra Roma min Articulo de Consecratione Elementorum Eucharisticorum*. Londini 1721. These posthumous writings deal with the problem that the Greek fathers considered it necessary, apart from the words of institution, to call upon the Holy Spirit to come down and to sanctify the bread and the wine and make them become Christ's body and blood. This is opposed to the current assumption. Grabe's idea of the transubstantiation does not equal the Catholic idea, but Reformed circles are likely to consider it not to be orthodox; for Grabe also cf. Günther Thomann: John Ernest Grabe (1666–1711): Lutheran Syncretist and Anglican Patristic Scholar, in: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 43 (1992), pp. 414–427. With an scholarly severity, Grabe e.g. shattered the illusions that William Whiston (1667–1752), a friend of Newton's, connected to the Apostolic Constitutions as a guidebook for the ecclesiastical restitution; in Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum, ut & Haeticorum, Seculi post Christum natum I [II & III]*. Oxoniae 1698/99, I, 40–55, he elucidates the difficult problem of the temporal determination of the Constitution. Whiston considered this to be the central early-Christian text that was handed down directly by Jesus. Also see: as above: *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd* [. . .]. London 1712, III, 14–24. Grabe tries in *An Essay on Two Arabic Manuscripts* [. . .]. London 1711, to show that the Constitutions was a compilation of an Arian writer from the 4th or 5th century.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Grabe: *[Vetus Testamentum iuxta Seputuaginta interpretes], quod ex antiquissimo Mss. Codice Alexandrino accurate descriptos* [. . .]. Oxonii 1707–1720; cf. Spanheim: *Lettre* (footnote 17), pp. 584/85.

<sup>26</sup> Spanheim rejects this, see *ibid.*: p. 616, (Simon), “Réponse à la lettre de Mr.

With this, we have reached the last stage of Spanheim's life. After a short mission in Paris, he had been working for the English Court since 1701. There he spent the rest of his life until his death in 1710, and the funeral took place in a chapel of Westminster Abbey, just the way he had wanted. Mr Grabe was asked to administer Spanheim's estate. But he himself died only one year later and did not contribute to the edition of the second volume of Spanheim's numismatic main work, which was based on new insights taken from his intellectual estate. Spanheim certainly corresponded with numerous people. But except for his correspondence e.g. with Leibniz, it seems to be largely lost.

## 3

According to Jacob Rambach (1693–1735), an important theorist for the *hermeneutica sacra* in the first half of the 17th century, there are two kinds of philologists.

I call those philologists *saniores*, who have *sana philologica*, who warrant and promote the safety of the Holy Scriptures. They are opposed to the *audaciores philologi*, who act on *principia* that make the whole exegesis uncertain and thus pave the way for the *scepticismus exegeticum*.<sup>27</sup>

There were two names he pointed out in particular: Ludovicus Cappellus and Richard Simon. Spanheim's interventions, which are mentioned in this text, are directed exactly against these two men. Spanheim's early writing was obviously designed to defend Buxtorf Jr against Cappell and bears the programmatic title "For the Age of the Hebrew Letters" (*Theses contra Ludovicum Cappellum pro antiquitate literarum hebraicarum*).<sup>28</sup> But we cannot say for sure in how far this

---

Spanheim, Ou Lettre d'un Théologien de la Faculté de Paris, qui rend compte à un de ses Amis de L'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, Attribuée au Père Simon de l'Oratoire" [1679], in: *ibid.*: *Histoire Critique* (footnote 17)—there are some divergences between this edition and the first one. I will not go into this, however—, pp. 623–667, here p. 666.

<sup>27</sup> Rambach: *Erläuterung über seine eigene Institutviones Hermeneuticae Sacrae aus der eignen Handschrift des seligen Verfassers mit Anmerckungen und einer Vorrede [. . .] ans Licht gestellt von D. Ernst Friedrich Neubauer*. Giessen 1738, lib. I, cap. II, § 5, pp. 106/107.

<sup>28</sup> The reason was Cappel: *Diatriba de veris & antiquis Ebraeorum literis, Opposita D. Joh. Buxtorfii, de eodem argumento, Dissertationi [. . .] Amstelodami 1645* (the epistola dedicatoria dates back to 1644).

(public) dispute, which quite amazingly took place without a chairperson (*sine praeside*), was really made public.<sup>29</sup> We suppose that the 16-year-old Spanheim mainly criticised the idea that the Samaritan Pentateuch was of older age than the Masoretic text. But the background of his criticism was probably the uncomfoting idea that the oldest form of the Hebrew text was originally a text full of consonants and that the vowels were inserted at a considerably later date.

This fact is nowadays no longer controversial not quite spectacular. When Cappell developed this idea, it was just the opposite: controversial and spectacular. From today's view, Spanheim's stance is certainly on the loosing side. But also in view of the Buxtorf's *Dissertationes philologico-theologicae*, which were published in the same year, he was certainly not a critic of Cappell's quality.<sup>30</sup> He actually did at various times give hints to these arguments in his writings about Simon, but most of the time with a certain detachment—regarding it as being a work from his youth (“mon enfance”).<sup>31</sup> But nevertheless, we can detect reservations later on in Spanheim's life although it was no more the original constellation. The criticism now was a radical one about the dignity of the Hebrew version of the Old Testament. Also, it was about the acceptance of the Samaritan Pentateuch by Jean Morin (1591–1659), who had converted to Catholicism. This also led to a high esteem of the tradition of the Septuagint.<sup>32</sup> But even more: Morin even considered that the ambi-

---

<sup>29</sup> At least I was not able to find any evidence. But two disputations on this subject given by the Hebrew scholar Constantin L'Empereur (1591–1648) do exist, although they were given three years later, cf.: *Diatriba I. [& II] de lingva Habraeotvm [. . .]. Lvgdvni Batavorvm* 1648. Twenty years earlier, L'Empereur had already committed himself to this topic, see *ibid.*: *Oratio Inavgyralis [. . .] Qvam De Linva Hebraeae dignitate ac utilitate [. . .]. Lvgdvni Batavorvm* 1627. But they were not included in the L'Empereur: *Disputationes Theologicae Octodecim [. . .]. Lvgdvni Batavorvm* 1648. There are at least two reprints under Spanheim's name: the first one being published in 1679 (non vidi) and the other one in the fourth volume of the collection: *Museum Haganum historico-philologico-theologicorum exstructum* (1774) by Nicolaus Barkey (1709–1788).

<sup>30</sup> Also cf. Buxtorf: *Dissertationes* [. . .]. Basileae 1645; in 1662, these four dissertations were published again, but now supplemented with twelve further dissertations on various subjects.

<sup>31</sup> Also cf. Spanheim: *Lettre* (footnote 17), p. 577; p. 592 could also have been an allusion to this; “dans un essai de jeune écolier”, and p. 603: “dans un âge peu avancé”, and again on p. 618: “[. . .] que de vous renoyer à un essai de jeune écolier, que je me souviens en écrivant ceci, d'avoir autrefois donné au Public sur cette matière.”

<sup>32</sup> Cf. e.g. Morin: *Exercitationes ecclesiasticae in vtrvmque Samaritanorvm Penta-*

guity—*sensus ambiguitas*—of the Old Testament might have been God's will.<sup>33</sup> Not only does this scholar repeatedly re-appear later in the argument; his ideas also enabled Spanheim to recognise similarities with Simon,<sup>34</sup> who was sometimes quite sceptical about his brother in faith.<sup>35</sup>

Doubts about the Hebrew punctuation were circulating in 16th century already. Of course, very revealing was the fact that such an analysis could be used in different ways. Luther even saw an “advantage” in the young age of the (Masoretic) “points” of the Hebrew text in the Old Testament, and especially in the insecurity that lay in the ‘letter’<sup>36</sup> and which could be used for the theological explanation (including the *spirit* in the way of the New Testament) against Jewish ones. The task was to restore the ‘actual’ text, which had been distorted by the Jews, to be a text according to the maxim of the Christological sense as a *sensus litteralis*, according to the *interpretatio secundum analogiam fidei* (‘analogy of faith’).<sup>37</sup> However, the Protestants

---

teuchvm, de illorum religione & moribus, de antiquis Hebraeorum litteris & siclis, cabalisticis Scripturae Sanctae interpretationibus, eiusque obscuris locis samaritano codice illustratis, variis Masorae & judaicorum Bibliorum corruptelis [. . .]. Parisiis 1631.

<sup>33</sup> See also: Morin: Exercitationes Biblicae de Hebraei Graecique textus sinceritate [. . .] Pars Prior [. . .]. Parisiis 1633, Ex. VI, pp. 198ff., there (on p. 197) we also find the example of the Hebrew expression (שׁמׁי), which can have two dozens of meanings.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Spanheim: Lettre (footnote 17), pp. 600/01, also pp. 611–13.

<sup>35</sup> Also cf. (Simon), Réponse (footnote 26), p. 662. Just shortly thereafter, Simon published a number of letters that mainly dealt with the problems of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Furthermore a biography of Morin was included in this work, in which he himself made a stand, cf. (Simon): Anitquitates Ecclesiae orientalis [. . .]. Quibus praefixa est Jo. Morini [. . .] Vita [1682]. Lipsiae & Francofurti 1683.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Luther: Vom Schem Hamphoras und vom Geschlecht Christi [1543], in: *ibid.*: Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 53. Vol. Weimar 1920, pp. 579–648, here: 647/8: “Mit dieser weise künd man der Jüden verstand jnn der Bibel fein schwächen, Und ist das vorteil da, das Mose und die Propheten nicht haben mit puncten geschrieben, welches ein new menschen fündlin, nach ihrer zeit auffbracht, Darumb nicht not ist, dieselben so steiff zu halten, als die Jüden gerne wolten, Sonderlich, wo sie dem neuen Testament zu wider gebraucht werden. [. . .] Die Jüden haben doch lust, all ir Ding zweifelhaftig und nichts gewisses zu machen.” Or, e.g. *ibid.*: [Lectures from 1535–1545 on the Book of Genesis], in: *ibid.*: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 44. Bd. Weimar 1915, p. 683: “Tempore Hieronymi nondum sane videtur fuisse usus punctorum, sed absque illis tot Biblia lecta sunt. Recentiores vero Hebraeos, qui iudicium de vero sensu et intellectu linguae sibi sumunt, qui tamen non amici, sed hostes scripturae sunt, non recipio. Ideo saepe contra puncta prononcui, nisi congruat prior sententia cum novo testamento, ex punctis enim nihil aliud relinquatur, quam merae divinationes: [. . .].”

<sup>37</sup> The step back to the Hebrew text without concentrating on the vowels but

very soon started to see rather the problems than the advantages. Matthias Flacius Illyricus (Matias Vlacič, 1520–1575) may have been the first to insist on the fact that the assumption that the vowels were added to the Hebrew original at a later time was an idea from the devil, so that the text and its interpretation became ‘insecure’.<sup>38</sup> This can be read in his first scientific work *Quod sacra scriptura integer, non tantum consonantibus, sed etiam vocalibus inde ab initio scripta fueri* (1546), which was published only three years after Luther’s statement.<sup>39</sup> Only with Cappell’s investigation in the post-Christian and Jewish origin of the Hebrew vowels in the Masoretic text did this idea not only gain philological importance, but also became more tangible again.

Flacius realised that here was the reason for the ability to create doubts in the ambiguity of the text and in the following insecurity of its interpretation. From a Protestant point of view, the *certitudo* of the interpretation was necessarily connected with the *unitas sensus*. The decisive point in this matter was the connection which the Protestants assumed to exist between the theological proof-theory (*probatio theologica*) and hermeneutics (*hermeneutica sacra*). This served as an explanation to the question why they were (at least until the middle of the 18th century) so hesitant to accept these findings. Due to the weaker connection between their doctrine concerning proofs and hermeneutics, Catholic scholars experienced far less problems in this area. This was precisely the topic of the dispute between

---

instead concentrating on the passages that were held for ‘certain’ (without falsifications) could later on lead to extensive speculations on the content of the Mosaic natural philosophy, e.g. in John Hutchinson’s (1674–1737) *Moses’s Principia* of 1724 (against Newton), for the latter see: David S. Katz: *The Hutchinsonians and Hebraic Fundamentalism in Eighteenth-Century England*, in: *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews*, ed. *ibid.* and Jonathan I. Israel. Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, Cologne 1990, pp. 237–255, *ibid.*: ‘Moses’s Principia’: Hutchinsonianism and Newton’s Critics, in: *Images of the Earth*. Chalfont St Giles 1979, ed. L. J. Jordanova and Roy Porter, pp. 3–22; C. B. Wilde: *Hutchinsonianism, Natural Philosophy and Religious Controversy in Eighteenth Century Britain*, in: *History of Science* 18 (1980), pp. 1–24; John C. English: *John Hutchinson’s Critique of Newtonian Heterodoxy*, in: *Church History* 68 (1999), pp. 58–597.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Flacius: *Alter Pars Clavis Scripturae, seu de Sermone Sacrarum literarum plurimas generales Regulas continens*. Basilae 1567, Tract. VI, pp. 474ff.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. as above, p. 479: “Quod autem insuper & incertitudo maxima sacrarum Literarum ex hac diabolica hypothesi sequitur: nonne nos vehementissime extimulare deberet, ut pro contraria sententia, tanquam pro aris ac focus, depugnaremus? Neque enim ullo modo credendum, Spiritum sanctum docendi magistrum omnium optimum tam obscure ac omnino certitudine omni carente, sicut daemonum oracula olim fecerunt, ratione coelestem doctrinam tradere voluisse.”



Spanheim and Simon's ideas on the *Tradition* as an element of the *probation theologica*. Relevant was Simon's distinction between *authenticity* and *origin* with respect to the *Tridentinum* claiming the Vulgate to be 'authentic'. Even though anonymously, Simon blew his own trumpet, stating that this was one of the best passages in his work. Without going into detail, we can say that this self-praise was quite justified. Simon determined the *authenticité* of his text in the view of the proof-theory which originated in theological claims of knowledge, i.e. the theological *authority*<sub>1</sub> in the view of the *probatio theologica*. The question of authenticity can then be connected to the theory of the testimony, i.e. with the *competence* and *honesty* of those, who handed all materials and information down.<sup>40</sup> So it was not (necessarily) the *autographa*, but possibly also the *apographa* that could reach such a status. On the other hand, the *origin* was not a question of the *probatio theologica*, but of the *hermeneutica*, i.e., in Simon's vocabulary: "Critique & Grammaire". This preserved the *authority*<sub>2</sub> as being the origin of the Holy Scriptures, of the *autographa* and with that of the Hebrew text (the *veritas hebraica*), as far as the Old Testament is concerned.<sup>41</sup>

The dispute about the age of the Hebrew punctuation reveals, as do other arguments as well, outstanding erudition on both sides; but a different point gives us even more insight of how these arguments were conducted. It is the problem of how one argued (philologically) about a question for which one used complex connections of historic testimonies with general theological ideas in order to find an answer. This is precisely the point that was debated upon in the writing 'The Revealed Secret of the Vowels'. This work was published anonymously in 1624 and contained a foreword by Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624), an expert on oriental studies and professor for Arabic at the University of Leiden and a student of Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609). The author of the writing was detected very soon, although Cappell admitted his authorship of this work only after quite a long time. He used methods of contemporary logics to classify and emphasise the well-known arguments. I will simplify: At first he recognised that the arguments for or against the age of the punctuation belonged to the doctrine of the *Loci* of the probable estimations.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Cf. (Simon): Réponse (footnote 26), p. 639: "[...] toute Version de la Bible faire par des personnes capables & non suspectes, est d'ellemême authentique."

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 651.

<sup>42</sup> (Cappellus): סוד היקוד והגללה hoc est Arcanvm Pvnctationis Revelatvm. Sive De

Then he came back to the differentiation between *artificialia* and *inartificialia*, that is between proficient and non-proficient *loci* or *argumenta*.<sup>43</sup> The *argumentorum ab auctoritate* was one of the non-proficient ones. These non-proficient ones had the lowest esteem in the contemporary thinking of logics.<sup>44</sup>

But the witticism did not lie in the differentiation itself, but in the way Cappell split the arguments up. The non-proficient arguments were those of a testimonial character, i.e., to a large extent the testimonies of Jewish writers. The proficient arguments, on the other side were *grammatica*, *historica* and *theologica*. He evaluated both kinds of arguments. The *argumentum ab auctoritate*, i.e., the testimonies that were put into words, were of lesser importance than certain plausible conclusions that could be verified by the texts themselves—a *testimonium tacitum et quasi reale*.<sup>45</sup> It is the text that indirectly bears witness

---

Punctorum Vocalium & Accentum Apud Hebraeos vera & germana Antiquitate, Diatriba, in lucam edita a Thoma Erpenio. Lugduni Batavorum 1624, lib. II, cap. 1, p. 187: "In hoc autem argumento vel Testimonium auctoritate, vel etiam Argumentis & Rationibus pugnantur. Et auctoritate quidem Iudaeorum, maximè vero recentiorum, adeoque hodiernorum. Argumenta autem potissimum sunt vel ab antiquitate, & Historia petita, vel sunt à rei Grammaticae ratione, sint potius à Naturâ & veluti genio hujus linguae ducta, vel sunt denique (ut sic ea appellem) Theologica, quia ijs Theologi potissimum utuntur." In his son's edition of 1689 not only this text was reprinted (see: Ludovici Capelli: [. . .] Commentarii & notae criticae in Vestus Testamentum [. . .]. Amstelodami 1689, pp. 697–790), but also the last reactions with respect to the people who criticised him. This reactions were published after his death.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, cap. 2ff., pp. 226ff.—For his esteem of (aristotelian) Logic, cf. Cappelle: *Le pivot de la foy & religion, ou preuve de la divinité contre les Athées et Prophanes*. Saumur 1643, p. 44: "Aristote n'a pas forgé & inventé comme il lui a plu les règles & préceptes de bien argumenter [. . .] mais seulement les a remarqués ès discours que tous les hommes font naturellement, & sur ces remarques en a dressé des règles [. . .] fixes, certaines & immuables, fondées sur le droit & naturel raisonnement commun à tous les hommes."

<sup>44</sup> Cf. L. Danneberg: *Säkularisierung, epistemische Situation und Autorität*, in: *Zwischen christlicher Apologetik und methodologischem Atheismus*, ed. Id. et al. Berlin 2002, pp. 19–66, see also Id.: *Die Anatomie des Text-Körpers und Natur-Körpers: das Lesen im liber naturalis und supernaturalis*. Berlin, New York 2002, chap. VI.

<sup>45</sup> See also: (Cappellus), as above, lib. I, cap. 4, § 1, p. 14: "Testimonivm duplex est veluti genus, Aliud enim est expressum seu explicitum, ac (ut ita dicam) vocale: aliud vero est veluti tacitum atque mutum quo non tam voce quam ipso facto perhibetur rei alicui testimonium. Ac non raro contingit, ut hoc posterius testimonij genius priore illo non sit minus certum, aut validum. Produximus hactenus ad novitatem Punctorum probandam Iudaeorum testimonia (ut ita dicam) vocalia & expressa: proferende iam sunt alia (ut sic loquar) relia, & quasi muta, sed prioribus illis non minus certa, ex quibus tamen eadem Puntorum novitas certissime, & demonstrari posit."'

to itself. The next step for him was to scrutinise the proficient arguments again, but just—and this is important—for the (philological) questions of the age of the punctuated Masoretic text: *on the one hand* grammar and history, *on the other side* theology. By expressing his ideas, Cappell already gave hints of how one should assess the authentic (Hebrew) text of the Holy Scriptures. These ideas already partly formulated the distinction of philological and theological arguments, particularly as far as the tradition of the works is concerned. The hierarchy in this matter was clear, although he formulated it by means of a comparison. “Quaestio videntur ista Philologica, & ad Criticam magis quam ad Theologiam pertinens, proindeque magna esse debet in eius definitione diversa sententium libertas.”<sup>46</sup>

The witticism could be seen even more clearly in his *Critica sacra*, which was finished in 1634, but apparently no Dutch publisher dared to publish it. In 1650, the work was published in Paris, edited by Cappell's converted son Jean Cappell under the protection of Marin Mersennes (1588–1645) and under the editorship of two important scholars of that time, the Jesuit Dionysius Petavius (1583–1652) and the above-mentioned Jean Morin. These two publishers were not truthful to the original text; they altered several passages, and were therefore severely reprimanded by the author. But the passages that are important to me were not altered. Cappell's voluminous and splendid first edition of his *Critica sacra* started, in the first book, with a comparison between the books of the Old Testament and their textual readings respectively. In the second book, he focused on a comparison between the quotations of the Old Testament in the New Testament.<sup>47</sup> In the third one, he drew a comparison to the Jewish and the Samaritan versions, especially the textual readings of Keri and Ketib; in the fourth book to the Septuagint; in the fifth book, to further translations. The theological climax of this work though, is to be found in the last chapter of the last book.<sup>48</sup>

Here we can find hints and suggestions, of how the textual criticism, which had already been applied to speak of the antique authors,

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., Praefatio Auctoris, (b3<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>47</sup> There is a separate appendix concerning this topic, see Cappell: *Critica sacra* sive de variis quae in sacris veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex [. . .]. Edita in Ivcm Studio & opera Ioannis Cappelli Auctoris filij. Lvtetiae Parisiorvm 1650, pp. 443ff.

<sup>48</sup> But also cf. *ibid.*, lib. VI, cap. 11, pp. 426–436, to “conjecturam quibus sensus commodior et planior efficitur.”

can be used for the Holy Scriptures. In this context we can also find the hermeneutical maxim, which claims that the tradition and recording of the Holy Scriptures should (all in all) be treated like the antique texts (i.e. according the methods of textual criticism): “*Criticae huius nostrae confirmatio, & illustratione, ex simili yariarum lectionum, in omni genere antiquorum librorum, observatione*”; thus reads the heading of the last chapter of the *Critica Sacra*. We assume, that only later, he has seen in the Cicero edition *Castigationes in Marci Tully Ciceronis locos quamplurimos* by Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne 1528–1598) the model and the similarities to the recordings of the profane authors acknowledged.<sup>49</sup> After having demonstrated the forms, and the origins, of errors in translations, Cappell mentioned the following as the decisive point.

Sic ergo ex hac viri istius doctissimi de mendorum origine & causis obseruatione, non contemnende peti potest huius nostrae Criticae illustratio, confirmatio, nostrique in ea defensio, quandoquidem nihil hic sacris libris accidisse volumes indoctorum librariorum imperitia, quod non caeteris omne genus libris & scriptis iampridem accidisse obseruarint viri longè doctissimi.<sup>50</sup>

This is where the hermeneutic maxim of equal treatment was expressed. This maxim formed the basis for the *hermeneutica generalis*, which was beginning to take shape in the 17th century, but likewise for an unforeseeable critic stimulus and for continuous antagonism towards the traditional *hermeneutica sacra*.<sup>51</sup> Finding it taking effect with Simon, Spanheim complained about this very maxim.<sup>52</sup> In his first writing, but above all in the *Critica sacra*, Cappel not only employed the common but controversial distinction between things mentioned in the Holy Bible that one had to believe in order to find salvation and things that were not indispensable for salvation,<sup>53</sup> but he asserted

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, where at the end it reads (cap. 12, p. 436): “Ex quibus manifestum est illum eosdem plane hic errorum, sive mendorum in Graecis & Latinis auctoribus fonts designare atq[ue] aperire, quos ego statim initio huius Criticae proposui, multis ante annis priusquam in hunc viri illius docti loctum incidissem.”

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Lutz Danneberg: *Logik und Hermeneutik im 17. Jahrhundert*, in: *Theorie der Interpretation vom Humanismus bis zur Romantik—Rechtswissenschaft, Philosophie, Theologie*, ed. Jan Schröder. Stuttgart 2001, pp. 75–131.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Spanheim: *Lettre* (footnote 17), p. 570: “[. . .]: qu’en exposant de-plus ces Livres Sacrés à toute la même destinée des Ouvrages appellés communément profanes; en ne reconnoissant aucun effet de la Providence divine dans leur conservation, & même en ayant pour but & principe [. . .].”

<sup>53</sup> See Cappellus: *Critica sacra* (footnote 47), lib. VI, cap. 1, p. 404: “[. . .] illa

that the uncertainties of the tradition of the text did not affect essential theological theories—in a word: *variae lectiones* may in some cases very well imply *multiplex varietas*, but not *multiplex veritas* in the relevant cases; in other words: Cappel doubts the authenticity of the *verba*, but not the truth of the *res* concerning *fides* and *mores*.<sup>54</sup>

Cappel's did not want to claim that the readings fixed by punctuation were all fictitious. He rather claimed that the contemporaries intended to determine the authentic and traditional meaning as exactly as possible, and so they fixed the reading by adding points. He was reproached for making the text with his philological uncertain. He refuted this, stating that—as a rule—the textual context allows only a single and at the same time a simple reading.<sup>55</sup> However, in case there are several possible interpretations, he sets down the rule: “Ea vera et certa punctatio est censenda, quae sensum parit verum, commodum, aptum, cohaerent et toti Scripturae consonum minimeque repugnantem.”<sup>56</sup> According to this rule, he wrote, there is only one punctuation that is “unica vera, propria et genuina”. So Cappel could likewise assert that the *initial* punctuation was ‘inspired’, much unlike the punctuation on hand.<sup>57</sup> This means that the interpreter, thanks to his ‘better’ understanding of the text, is not bound to the Masoretic punctuation, but he can correct it (by reconstructing the *initially inspired* one). Against this background, Cappel explicitly rejected making use of the philological findings about the Hebrew punctuation within the controversial theological analysis. Accordingly, the last two chapters are entitled “Probatur posse nihilominus [Pontificios] jure urgeri auctoritatem Textus Hebraici”<sup>58</sup> and “Probatur haberi posse certo verum & germanum textus Hebraici sensum sine Punctorum Masorethicorum subsidio”.<sup>59</sup>

---

res sint dogmata ad fidem & mores spectantia, siue historiae & narrationes, quae ad fidem, spem, consolationem piorum & fidelium alendam, fovendam, generandam plurimum faciunt, suntq[ue] [. . .]” etc. According to the contemporary way of thinking, the problem lies in the distinction between things which were de fide ex parte objecti and things not necessarily worth knowing or even worth generally negating, but which are at the same time de fide ex parte dicentis.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 400: “[. . .] non est in illa diversitas ad fidem et mores [. . .]”.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, lib. II, cap. 22, § 6, p. 286: “Sed his omnibus occurritur unica facilis & obvia distinctio.”

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, §§ 12/13, pp. 289/90.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. XXVI, pp. 305–307.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. XXVII, pp. 307–310.

When the vocalisation was full of uncertainties, the interpretation did not necessarily had to be unreliable, since the latter depended on the *harmony of the text as a whole*:

Sed iudicium ultimum de verâ certâ & indubitâtâ lectione fieri debet ex totâ omnium vocum in singulis periodis structurae, ordine & serie, atque mutuo inter se respectu, item ex collatione cum antecedentibus & consequentibus, adeoque ex tota totius Scripturae inter se *συναρμωσία*, analogiâ & perpetuo sensu, ut ea vera & certa punctatio sit censenda quae sensum parit verum, commodum, aptum cohaerentem et toti Scripturae consonum, minimeque repugnantem.<sup>60</sup>

Spanheim did allude to this asseveration, but he was not thoroughly convinced.<sup>61</sup> It was, in fact, an *argumentum ab auctoritate*. Even if Cappels honesty as a testifier was not doubted (and it has quite often been doubted), this was a weak *ad hominem* argument, since at that time it was an assertion that could not be checked by the *argumenta artificialis* and that—even with Cappel—was still only backed up by the presumption that there was a *divine Providence*.

Simon endorsed this, but he (tacitly) tried to eliminate this weakness with Cappel's suggestions about the reconstruction of the original text from the *argumenta artificialis*, i.e. the inevitable expertise in Hebrew. The rules he established and applied were meant both to facilitate criticism and the restitution of the tradition of the text and derived, he said, directly from the “nature de la Langue Hébraïque”.<sup>62</sup> This is where Spanheim saw the crucial problem, as he concluded from this that there was neither a divine Providence nor the authority of the Fathers, the Councils or the Church Tradition.<sup>63</sup>

The only argument against the maxim of equal treatment was the specific character of the writings as the Word of God and, simultaneously, the largely ignorable individual influence of the writers and copiers. If one accepted this against the backdrop of the scriptural doctrine, the maxim of equal treatment will continuously clash with every special assumption of God's efficacy within the framework of a supernatural history of the textual tradition of the Holy Bible. It

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 289.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Spanheim: Lettre (footnote 17), p. 567: “[. . .] & que les Exemplaires du Vieux Testament les plus corruptus soient suffisans à cet égard.”

<sup>62</sup> Cf. (Simon): Réponse (footnote 26), p. 634.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Spanheim: *ibid.*, p. 602: “Il n’y a plus, si on le croit, de Providence divine, plus d’autorité de Peres ou de Conciles, plus de Tradition d’Eglise [. . .].”

was *God's Will*, as many theologians say even in the 18th century, to protect the text of the Holy Bible, God's Word, against considerable depravation. With regard to the punctuation of the Masoretic text, this providential argument could be extended to the tradition of the *veritas hebraica*. Taking together the idea of inspiration and the divine Providence thus provided for a justification to create a definite and certain sense wherever a current text had, in terms of historical knowledge, been destroyed or ambiguous. In a time when textual critical reflections seemed to endanger the *certitude of the doctrine*, the reference to God's Will as a warrant for the integrity of *his own* testimony became an effective means to exorcise the *scepticismus hermeneuticus*, which was given rise to by the philology of the textual tradition.

The orthodox Protestant idea of the theopneustia as a support of the status of the Holy Bible as the (sole) standard may well have got into trouble by Cappel's considerations; but referring to the supernatural history of the textual tradition of the Holy Bible made it possible to refute this by making a *special* assumption of God's will—as a *creatio continua*, as it were, that includes *conservatio* and that would always resolve the conflict between the findings of textual criticism and special features of the text that was to be interpreted.<sup>64</sup> Of course, it was not true to say that the scholarly theologians had not considered enough arguments or that they thoughtlessly sought—as Spinoza sneered—the *asylum ignorantiae* of the Providence. But it provided the backdrop for integrity and, above all, for the hope that the authenticity of the texts could *also* be explained with arguments

---

<sup>64</sup> More extreme examples include the philosophic demonstration of the authenticity of the punctuation by general principiis cognoscendi (largely after Christian Wolff) and by the doctrines of God, which focuses on a special part of the principles—"specialioribus principiis de sacra Scriptura traditis, ipsa demonstratio suscipitur" (cap. II, § LXXXVIII, p. 49), including numerous more general principles, e.g. "Scriptura sacra nihil docere potest, quod perfectionibus repugnat" (§ LXXXIX, p. 50) or "Sacra scriptura est perfectissimum & optimum medium, quo voluntas diuina cognosci potest" (§ XCV, p. 52), completed by a number of principles of the conception of meaning of the hermeneutica sacra, which argue that ambiguity has no determined sense (and thus allows no interpretation that could claim to be true) and that this, following the conclusion "Sine accentibus sensus non perfecte est determinatus" (§ CX, p. 65) has as a result: "Accentus & vocales sunt diuinae originis" (§ CXVII, p. 67), cf.: In Dissertationem Qva in Divina Vocalivm et Accentvum V. T. Origine ex Principiis Cognoscendi Evidentibus Demonstranda Vsvs Philosophiae Wolffianae [. . .] Praeses Phil. Nicol. Wolffivs [. . .] Respondente Phil. Lavrentio Levnio [. . .]. Gissae 1740.

and with the progress that philology made. It was thus the question—which cannot be answered here—of what had to happen that such hopes became obsolete in broad scale.

Around the middle of the 17th century, this was not yet the case at all. Spanheim's early preference for the age and the authenticity of the Masoretic text may from today's perspective be on the losers' side, but neither was it unreasonable nor the opinion of a minority of the *scientific community*.<sup>65</sup> The hope for the Providence is most clearly expressed when the *Consensus Helvetica* of 1675 elevated the integrity of the Masoretic text to the integrity of the creed and thus suppressed any distinction between theology and philology. In his reply

---

<sup>65</sup> In 1739 so eminent a person as the biblical philologist Johann David Michaelis could still support the old age of the punctuation; only twenty years later on he explicitly abandoned it; cf. *ibid.*: *Dissertatio de punctorum Hebraicorum antiquitate* [ . . . ]. Halaë 1739, and *ibid.*: *Beurtheilung der Mittel, welche man anwendet, die ausgestorbene hebräische Sprache zu verstehen*. Göttingen 1757. Model writings in the German-speaking countries are August Pfeiffer (1640–1698): *Critica Sacra, De Sacri Codicis Partione* [ . . . ]. Editio Sexta [ . . . 1680]. Dresdae et Lipsiae 1721, cap. IV, p. 60–99, or Johann Gottlob Carpzov (1679–1767): *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti* [ . . . ]. Lipsiae 1728, pars I, cap. II–IV, pp. 61–140, cap. V, sect. VII–cap. VI, pp. 241–321, pars III, cap. III, pp. 891–898, where the reader finds a knowledgeable counter-critical discussion of the different controversial questions about the Hebrew text. Another example is provided by the VIIIth disputation lead by Heinrich Benzelius (1689–1758): *Syntagmata Dissertationum* [ . . . ]. Francofurti et Lipsiae 1745. An example for the both extensive and absolute defence of the Holy Bible not only regarding the Hebrew tradition is provided by Friedrich Wagner (1693–1760): *Die Wahrheit und Göttlichkeit der h. Schrift und Christl. Religion. Wieder Johann Christian Edelmanns vornehmste Getichte und Entwürfe Durch Beleuchtung eines einigen Haupt-Spruchs heil. Schrift vorläufig gerettet*. In drei Abtheilungen. Hamburg 1748. Johann Salomo Semler (1725–1791): *Lebensbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefaßt. Zweiter Theil*. Halle 1782, p. 121, reads in retrospect: “In Absicht der hebräischen Bibel herrschten noch Buxtorfs, Wasmuths, Danzens Grundsätze; da war alles göttlichen Ursprungs und Ansehens; sogar die Verschiedenheiten, die in der gedruckten Bibel angetroffen werden unter dem Namen Kri und Ktib hatte Hiller, dessen Arcanum ich schon als Schüler besaß, nach seiner neuen Hypothese beide bestätigt, daß der heilige Geist durch den Esra die Exemplarien noch einmal revidieren und gerade so eintichten ließ, wie sie nun angetroffen werden. Gleichwohl hatte ich aus Waltons Prolegomenis und Richard Simons histoire critique des Alten Test. solche Beobachtungen und Sammlungen mir gemacht, die ich für wahr hielt; aber den reißenden Strom der in Deutschland herrschenden Philologie entgegenzustellen mich noch nicht getraute, weil ich gar keinen deutschen Gelehrten kannte, der nicht schon lange des R. Simon und Clericus Schriften unter die böserartigen antiscripturarios zu setzen pflegte.” But nine years on, a complete though unsuccessful criticism of Cappel's conclusions is published by Adam Benedikt Spitzner (1717–1793): *Vindiciae originis & auctoritatis diuinæ punctorum vocalium & accentuum in libris sacris Veteris Testamenti, vbi imprimis ea diluuntur, quae post Eliam Leuitam Ludov. Cappellii in arcana punctationis ejusque vindicias opposuit* [ . . . ]. Lipsiae 1791.



to Simon, Spanheim quite rightly remarked that not only Cappel did not resolve the question about the relatively young age of the "Points-voyelles du Texte Hebreu", but that the scholars had not yet agreed upon that question and that *thus* everybody was free to entertain either opinion. At the same time he reprimanded that Simon called everybody who did not go along with him (and Cappel) in this question an ignorant scholar—without giving a single thought to the decision to resolve this question by defining it as the integrity of the creed in the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*.<sup>66</sup>

With a few hints I will try to describe the systematic context that outlines the problem with regard to the contemporary doctrine of the testimony. Two relations are to be distinguished—on the one hand a *relation of authority*: the testifier warrants the authority (the truth) of a testimony; on the other hand a *relation of origin*: the testimony leads back to the testifier. In the first case we need a theory explaining how the authority established by the original testifier can be protected against transformations during its transportation through space and time—in other words: the testimony is a historic event that may however have a continuous authority in space and time. In the second case we need a theory showing how the testifier of a given testimony can be found and identified. Both relations proved to be crucial problems of the interpretation of the Holy Bible, and the interpretation claims the testimony to be represented by the Word of God and to manifest itself in the Holy Bible that we were given. The fact that now and then God himself is speaking in the Bible, that this is reported or conveyed by human testifiers; the fact that the testimony directly conveyed by God is testified by chosen ones but also by others; the fact that certain events are exclusively reported by human testifiers (such as the event of the resurrection) shows how complex dimensions the relation of authority can assume, never mind the changes the (material) testifying medium undergoes or may undergo during its tradition (by copying or translation).

It is the very tracing back of the relation of origin for which philology is shaping up so exorbitantly. The transformations a testimony has undergone need to be traced back at least to the first mediating scriptures, if not to the original testifier. And as it were, a

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Spanheim: Lettre (footnote 17), p. 577: "[. . .] on peut, direz-vous, avec la même liberté s'attacher à l'opinion contraire, sans passer d'abord pour un ignorant, ou pour un entêté, comme voudroit persuader le Pere Simon."

genealogical and causal chain needs to be brought out into the open in order to prove what the relation of authority declares to be possible: the conservation of authority despite a complicated process of mediation of the testimony. In this context of the *testimonium* we need the philological reflections, and it is those reflections that threaten to assume a confusing sceptical weight as soon as they foster doubts about the certain traditional authorship relations.

But it is not as simple as it may seem. No one involved will ever have cherished the illusion that it would be possible to prove an almost complete causal genealogical chain down to the first autograph, to the *codex certus et immotus*. Substitutes had to be found. Substitutes were, on the one hand, the tradition in the sense of the merely historical tradition of certain characteristics of the text and, on the other hand, the text itself, which was believed to contain hints about its origin. These two points explain the, at first glance surprising, fact that doubts about a certain authorship or a certain age bereave the text of whatever authority, but not so in other cases.<sup>67</sup> Only a handful of interpreters have had no doubts that Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews—and these doubts could only be inherent in the text—, but hardly has any interpreter doubted the authority of the text.

The massive alterations by human will were not the only problem with the fixing of the punctuation as a comparatively late ‘interpretation’ of the text, so that the tradition was based on an *auctoritas humana et incerta*. The problem was, above all, the confidence in the testifier. Basically, the testimony doctrine have two aspects: on the one hand the *praesumptio* of honesty, on the other hand that of competence (*iudicium*). Both *praesumptiones* are the preconditions for the at least *theoretical* reduction of the testimony to *argumenta artificialis* or to autopsy. One might have conceded the latter, but the first caused difficulties. It meant to trust in the honesty of those of all people who did not read the Old Testament as did the Christians, those who were seen as so inveterate or, to put it in Johann Gottfried Herder’s words: a “widerspenstiges, hartes, undankbares, freches

---

<sup>67</sup> The examples are legion already before the 16th century—St Thomas Aquinas, for instance, writes with reference to the Book of Job that it was quite unimportant if and when its author, Job thus, had lived or if it was “parabola conficta [. . .] ad providentiae disputationem”; this, he says, is irrelevant for the meaning of the text, cf. *ibid.*: *Expositio in Job* “ad litteram” [126–1264]. Roma 1965, 4, 72–79.

Volk".<sup>68</sup> Moreover, Christians were eager to find evidence in the Old Testament for their essential Christological dogmas—including the Holy Trinity—and, with it, a distinction between Jews and Christians. This repeatedly lead people to think that Jews involved in the tradition tried to hide clear traces that were still evident in the autograph. This suspicion is in fact far older, but in the 16th, and even more in the 17th century, it assumed excessive proportions.

The reactions to this problem could vary. From the Protestant point of view, Isaak Vossius (1618–1689), feeling forced by philology to do so, slaughtered one of the sacred cows of his brothers in faith, the Hebrew text, only a few years before Spanheim's intervention. He tried to solve the problems of the uncertain tradition, supposing God to have intervened once more, namely when the Hebrew text was *translated*.<sup>69</sup> Praising the Septuagint, he on the one hand deprived the Protestants of one of their arguments against post-Tridentine Catholicism, on the other hand, while doing so, he tried to provide a foundation for a firm textual basis for the certitude and integrity of the interpretation. Rejected outright at the beginning, this turned into an offer that Spanheim—unlike Simon—got to like perfectly well in view of the threatening *pyrrhonismus hermeneuticus*.<sup>70</sup>

Regardless of the assumption of inspiration, a problem became apparent concerning the philology of editions in general. Tracing

---

<sup>68</sup> Herder, Briefe, das Studium der Theologie betreffend. Erster Theil [1780, 1785], in: Id., Sämmtliche Werke, ed. Bernhard Suphan. Bd. 10. Berlin 1879, pp. 1–152, p. 141.

<sup>69</sup> See also J. C. H. Lebram: Ein Streit um die hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta, in: Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century, ed. Th. H. Lundsingh et al. Leiden 1975, pp. 21–63.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Spanheim: Lettre (footnote 17), p. 583. Vossius reacted at once to Simon's criticism of the defence of the Septuaginta; cf. *ibid.*: Responsio ad Objecta nuperae criticae Sacrae [1680], in: *ibid.*: Variarum Observationum liber. Londini 1685, pp. 297–342, on which Simon responds in an appendix: Castigationes Theologi cuiusdam Parisiensis ad opusculum Isaaci Vossii de sibyllinis oraculis, & eiusdem responsionem ad objectiones nuperae criticae sacrae; to his work *ibid.*: Disquisitionibus criticis de variis, per diuersa loca & tempora, bibliorum editionibus [. . .]. Londini 1684; Vossius in turn replies in *ibid.*: Ad Iteratas Patris Simonii Objectiones Altera Responsio, in: *ibid.*: Variarum (*ibid.*), pp. 345–297; Simon again replies in: Opuscula critica aduersus Isaacum Vossium [. . .]. Defenditur sacer Codex Ebraicus & B. Hieronymi Translatio. Edinburgi 1685, attached with a separate title page and paginated separately: Iudicium de nupera Isaacu Vossii ad iteratas P. Simonii objectiones responsione, which Simon writes under the pseudonym "Hieronymi le Camus", and finally, in response to this: Vossius, Observationum ad Pomponium Melam Appendix. Accedit eiusdem ad tertias P. Simonii Objectiones Responsio [. . .]. Londini 1686.

back according to the relation of origin usually presumes the older text to be the better one, following the old maxim Simon found with Tertullianus: *In quantum enim falsum corruptio est veri, in tamen praecedat necesse est veritas falsum.*<sup>71</sup> But the quote is not the problem. The problem arises as soon as one realises that the history of tradition can not only ramify, but that pivotal testifiers of that history may have got lost. So the *translation* of the Septuagint, necessarily younger and thus in principle not better than the Hebrew archetype, may nonetheless be better than everything that is left over from the Hebrew text, since it might be the translation of another Hebrew text that is better than all that have been handed down. And this is the point where the question about the age of the punctuation gains its systematic substance if it turns out to be younger than the Septuagint and the Vulgate.

Rambach was not the first to expose hermeneutic scepticism, which recent bible philology seems to lead to. In his *Monatsgespräche* (Monthly Discussions) from 1688, Christian Thomasius (1655–1728) already considered it a “nothwendig Werk”,

daß ein gelehrter *Theologus* das Werck recht ex fundamento aufgreiffe/ weil man [. . .] ins gemein dem Pater Simon Schuld giebet/ als ob aus seinen Grund-Regeln/ die er sich zu behaupten getrauet/ die Gewißheit der gantzen Christlichen *Religion* über den Hauffen gestossen würde/ [. . .] ja weil sein vornehmstes Absehen ist/ zu erweisen/ daß die Schrifft als dunckel die Richterin in Glaubens-Sachen nicht seyn könne/ sondern sie nothwendig der *Tradition* der Kirche von dem Verstand derselben leyden müsse.<sup>72</sup>

But Thomasius was careful, asking his interlocutor to consider that this conclusion was not least drawn from the fact that nobody had read Simon’s work, although people had shown their appreciation only recently, calling it “ein curieuses und von der allerhöchsten Gelahrheit angefülltes Werk sey”. But he wrote he doubted whether it was really that easy to refute the criticism of the New Testament: “ob die *Refutation* der *Criticae Novi Testamenti* so leichte fallen werde/ [. . .] ich bin der unmaßgeblichen Meinung/ daß weder die *Critica Veteris*, noch die *Critica Novi Testamenti*, sich in einer schlechten

---

<sup>71</sup> Several times in Simon: *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament, où l’on établit la Verité des Actes sur lesquels la Religion chrétienne est fondée*. Rotterdam 1689, e.g. pp. 16f.

<sup>72</sup> Thomasius: *Freymüthige, lustige und ernsthafte, jedoch vernunft- und gesetzmäßige Gedancken oder Monatsgespräche*. Bd. I. Halle 1688, p. 711.

*Academischen Disputation* refutieren lasse.”<sup>73</sup> At least, this was Thomasius’ point, “andere arma als die *Theologiam Scholasticam* und *Polemicam* mit auff den Kampff-Platz [zu bringen]”<sup>74</sup> Nevertheless Thomasius thought Simon to be an “ungodly man”, whose work on the Old Testament has “den Grund des Christlichen Glaubens die heilige Schrift bey nahe gar über den Hauffen stößt/ indem er vorgiebet/ daß die Bibel in vielen Stücken *corrupt* wäre [. . .].”<sup>75</sup> Later, Thomasius, too, was anything but a friend of Cappel’s and of Simon’s Bible criticism.

Spanheim was not the first, but the second scholar to react on Simon’s *Critica Veteris Testamenti*, and he had read this book thoroughly, even if under pressure. The letter to a friend is dated 10 December 1678, which was when Spanheim had left the Netherlands for his mission in England. Noticeably, it was the review of a book not yet published. Although printed, the *Histoire Critique Vieux Testament* was never delivered. Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), a mighty Catholic controversialist of his time, objected to it and after casual perusal it was pulped. After the introduction, his eyes may have been terrified by the view of the chapter heading announcing doubts about Moses being the author of the Pentateuch: “Moïse ne peut être l’Auteur de tout ce qui est dans les Livres qui lui sont attribués.”<sup>76</sup> So only the copies delivered before the launch have been read, and Spanheim reported that he had found no more than two copies in England, one of which was given to him for a short time.<sup>77</sup> Nonetheless he did a good job, as it were. He wrote in a relatively moderate though determined and matter-of-fact, sometimes even astute language. Now, what was it about?

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 712/13.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 713/14.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 710.—Almost 70 years on Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten (1706–1757): *Nachrichten von merkwürdigen Büchern* 10 (1756), p. 491, still remarks that this “berühmt-berüchtigte Buch” deserves a “genauere Kenntnis gar wohl verdient” and that it is full “mit häufigen aus Unwissenheit, Vorurtheil und Neuerungssucht herrührenden Unrichtigkeiten und Irthümern”.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. also Simon: *Histoire Critique* (footnote 17), Preface de l’Auteur, \*\*\*2<sup>v</sup>, sowie p. 31: “Moïse ne peut être l’Auteur de tout ce qui est dans les Livres qui lui sont attribués.”

<sup>77</sup> For the identification of both copies cf.: *Bibliothèque critique de diverses Pièces critiques dont la plupart ne sont point imprimées* [. . .]. tom III. Amsterdam 1708, p. 54, and (Simon): *Lettres choisies* [. . .]. nouv. éd. tom. IV. Rotterdam 1705, letter dated 9 Feb. 1679, p. 58; the bringer was the Protestant Henri Justel (1620–1693). An English translation of this work is published as early as 1682, including An Answer to Mr Spanheim’s Letter.

The doubts about the authorship of the Pentateuch are old<sup>78</sup> and have been uttered also by scholars who were not suspected of heterodoxy, e.g. by Andreas Masius (1573), by his student Bento Pereira (1605–1681) or by Jacobus Bonfrerius (Bonfrère, 1573–1643); the first modern scholar, providing full explanations in *De Canonicis Scripturis Libellus* from 1520,<sup>79</sup> seemed to be Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (ca. 1477–1541). After all, the fact that Moses himself wrote about his own death and his tomb that was never found, has always been cited. As I already mentioned, the doubt about some authorship does not necessarily shake the confidence in the authority of a text, however. But Simon had more than the traditional doubts. He laid out a new *theory of origin*. It explained a lot, seemingly providing a solution to the unpleasant problems that seemed insurmountable in the 17th century, such as varying chronological data. A simplistic illustration of Simon's theory should suffice here.

In its construction, his work was similar to Cappel's *Critica sacra*, which Simon, though scarcely lavish with praise, esteemed more than any other book. Part one dealt with the Hebrew text, part two with its translations and part three with the rules for accurate translation and interpretation. The theory of origin of the first book concerned the Hebrew text. The theory basically presumed the set-up of 'public' and inspired scribes ("Prophètes ou Ecrivains publics", "Scribes ou Prophètes") gathering and editing reports and publishing them following certain different criteria.<sup>80</sup> What can be explained by these presumptions were, for instance, the differences in traditional depictions caused by the complicated process of gathering and editing, overlapping in time. On the one hand we must emphasise the quasi-

---

<sup>78</sup> With reference to the origin of the Pentateuch, Luther replies to the assertion that some believed the Pentateuch not to be of Mosaic origin (cf. *ibid.*: Tischreden. Bd. 3. Weimar 1914, No. 2844b, p. 23): "Quid hoc ad rem? Esto Moses non scripserit, attamen est Mosi liber; hic enim liber solus mundi conditionem optime describit. Quaestiones autem frigidae et ineptae fugendae, [. . .]."

<sup>79</sup> Heinrich Tottling von Oyta (1330–1397): *Quaestio de veritatibus catholicis* [1378–80]. Ad fidem manuscriptorum edidit Albertus Lang. Monasterii 1933, argues that the fact that Moses speaks in the third person was not unusual for a compiler and did not undermine his authorship; he refers to Jer 36:27, which tells about Baruch, the scribe of Jeremiah, 'the words which Baruch had written at the instruction of Jeremiah the prophet.'

<sup>80</sup> Simon reasserts this in his reply to Spanheim, cf. *ibid.*: "[. . .] que les Livres de l'Écriture qui nous restent présentement, ne sont que des Abregés des ces anciens Actes, qui étoient beaucoup plus étendus; mais qu'on a seulement compilé ce que l'on a jugé nécessaire alors pour l'instruction du peuple."

institutional character of these records by inspired scribes; which satisfied the *relation of authority*—at least in Simon's view, as he pointed out in his reply to Spanheim—,<sup>81</sup> on the other hand, an editing and rendering intended to serve certain respective purposes allowed an interpretation as a purposeful process so that the reproach of falsification or insufficiency seemed irrelevant; since the differences could be explained by the act of choosing, which then served a purpose and were rational in that sense. Towards the middle of the 18th century, Jean Astruc (1684–1766), who converted from Calvinism to Catholicism and achieved fame as a medic, tried on his own, basically on the grounds of the different names for God in the text, to identify two distinct parts of the Pentateuch with his 'hypothesis of sources' ("Quellenhypothese").<sup>82</sup> However, this idea had an effect only after it was adopted by Protestants such as Johann David Michaelis (1717–1791), Heinrich Scharbau (1689–1759) and, notably, Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827).

But philological 'findings' of this kind will always be the result of complex and assessing *decisions* and thus they can be objected in many different ways. Both doubt and the rejection of the doubt are woven into a complex texture of presumptions, and this had effects on the consequences that may be concluded from given findings. This explained why certain claimed knowledge had for a long time not become common property.<sup>83</sup> The hermeneutic *rules* for the interpretation could—if necessary—be isolated from such complex constellations, but not the hermeneutic *decisions* in the given situations.

---

<sup>81</sup> For his thoughts about inspiration, which largely followed the ideas Jesuits developed in the late 17th century, cf. (Simon): *De l'inspiration des livres sacres: avec une réponse au livre intitulé: Défense des sentiments de quelques Theologiens de Hollande* [. . .] par le Prieur de Bolleville. Rotterdam 1687, also: *Id., Histoire critique* (footnote 71), pp. 280–84. Leonard Lessius (1554–1623) and others were censured in 1586 by the Faculty of Louvain for having held that the Bible may contain materials which do not derive directly from the inspiration of God, vgl. (d.i. Simon): *De l'inspiration des livres sacres: avec une réponse au livre intitulé: Défense des sentiments de quelques Theologiens de Hollande* [. . .] par le Prieur de Bolleville. Rotterdam 1687, also: *Id., Histoire critique* (footnote 71), pp. 280–84.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. (Astruc): *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moÿse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse*. Bruxelles 1753, there (p. 9), one also finds a reverence to Simon (and Clericus).

<sup>83</sup> That is how e.g. Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg: *Die Authentie des Pentateuches*. Bd. 1. Berlin 1836, on 80 pages of his Prolegomena identifies the 'fragmentary nature of the Pentateuch' (p. LXIII) as the basic problem of the 'more recent criticism' (this aims at other theologians, however).

In view of such situations of assessing, at least three elements are informative: *firstly*, it is never a simple textual finding that comes into conflict with the claim of authority of the respective writing, but a network of interconnected presumptions which bring the textual findings to bear by means of ‘fixings’. Even when the connection between the testifier and the testimony created by human interference is considered less close than in more orthodox inspiration theories, the question about, for instance, the actual authorship becomes less important,<sup>84</sup> and so the doubts about the authorship of Moses do not have to raise any particular doubts about the authenticity of the Word of God as presented in the testimony. *Secondly* it is important to emphasize that the conclusions drawn in connection with the claimed knowledge (and the interpretation of the Bible) are indirectly dependent on such (background) presumptions. *Thirdly* it is significant that the modification of these presumptions, but also the correction of the instructive hermeneutic concept of interpretation can *always* help to settle or avoid conflicts between textual findings and e.g. the postulate of truth which the authorised Bible is provided with.

It is no less informative to distinguish the directions the doubts may aim at (e.g. viewing the criticism of the Pentateuch authorship): against the *truth* of the text (when the text is contradictory), or against its *authorisation* as being true. The latter can, if there is doubt, develop thanks to the authorship that warrants or authorises the truth, and may extend to the problems of determining the credibility of testifiers and the problems of estimating the evidential value of testimonies. The change in the postulate of truth becomes evident in the question about the *historic probability* of the testimonies of e.g. the evangelists. This is indeed dependent on the fact that the testimony in the logicians’ works from the late 17th and the early 18th centuries, much like the *hermeneutica* in general, is now treated in the light of the *probabilitas*.<sup>85</sup>

In his Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus, Thomas Sherlock (1678–1761) gives one of many examples reflecting this idea

---

<sup>84</sup> See also Lutz Danneberg: Zum Autorkonstrukt und zu einem methodologischen Konzept der Autorintention, in: Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs, ed. Fotis Jannidis et al. Tübingen 1999, pp. 77–105.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Lutz Danneberg: Probabilitas hermeneutica. Zu einem Aspekt der Interpretations-Methodologie in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts, in: Aufklärung 8 (1994), pp. 27–48.



of the testimony and the testifiers.<sup>86</sup> Sometimes the performed calculations suffice up to the moment when certain events (e.g. the Resurrection) have lost whatever plausibility.<sup>87</sup> After all, the doubt can generally aim against the possibility of making *inquiries* about the true sense. It is one of the most common arguments put forward in order to show the necessity of reverting to other sources of knowledge or to put the interpretation of the Bible under specific factual premises. In the theories of interpretation the complexity of the hermeneutic decision is reflected, which is to be reached on grounds of the findings and the rules; sometimes it is also reflected in the evaluation of the relevant rules, in their order and in the nature of their interrelation, but the philological assessment will always stay approximate.

But these are not the insights gained during the discussion around the transition from the 17th to the 18th century, and they were not the point that seemed so unbearable to the Protestants of that time. It appeared against the backdrop of the Protestant *sola scriptura* maxim. At least in questions of faith, it considered the Holy Bible the ultimate authority, in the strict sense even the *principium cognoscendi*—a pre-eminence that is inherent only to this maxim and that it does not have to share with any equal church tradition regarded as the Bible's external human work. It seems difficult to defend this maxim at first glance, even less if one thinks about how many of the presumed dogmas cannot be explained by the *sensus explicitus* of the Holy Bible—starting with the dogma of Trinity and its scriptural evidence. So *sola scriptura* was rather understood in the sense of *prima scriptura*. Moreover, Protestant theorists developed ingenious ideas of a *sensus implicitus* and lead complicated discussions on drawing conclusions from mixed sets of premises. It is not least such serious difficulties

---

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Sherlock: Gerichtliches Verhör der Zeugen der Auferstehung Jesu, Worinnen nicht nur des berüchtigten Woolstens Einwürffe [. . .] unpartheyisch erwogen werden [The Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus, 1729]. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt. Nebst einer Vorrede [. . .] von Johann Adam Schier [1748]. Vierte und vermehrte Aufl. Leipzig 1751. Later a translation of a "sequel of the trial". Similarly e.g. Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694–1768): Apologie oder Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes [posthumous]. 2 vols. Frankfurt M. 1972, vol. II, book 3, ch. 3, § 3, pp. 212ff.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. John Craig (d 1731): Theologiae christianae principia mathematica [1699]. Edidit atqve de scriptis avtoris nonnvlla praefatvs est. Io. Dan. Titivs [. . .]. Lipsiae 1755; the critical Praefatio by the mathematician and physicist Johann Daniel Titius (Tietz, 1729–1796) is quite informative.

the *probatio theologica* gets into, thanks to its intimate connection with the *hermeneutica sacra*, which to a great extent makes the history of *hermeneutica sacra* seem like a history of *Protestant* hermeneutics.

One of the more important arguments in favour of the *sola scriptura* principle was the fact that the priority of authority seemed to coincide with the priority of time: first the Bible as the Word of God, then the tradition being based on it. In view of the pre-eminence of the Roman bishop, one claim of temporal priority played a role for the Catholics, too, namely Peter's stay in Rome, which—regrettably in the Catholic point of view—is not explicitly mentioned in the Bible. In a scholarly 1679 *Dissertatio de ficta profectioe Petri apostoli in urbem Romam deque non una traditionis origine*, Friedrich Spanheim the Younger held the radical opinion that Peter had not been in Rome at all<sup>88</sup>—Reformed Christians such as Molinaeus or Amyraut had at least conceded this, but without inferring the primacy of the Roman bishop from it. In fact it is a topic at one of the Spanheim-Conferences, and it may well be that Ezechiel Spanheim took his brother's text into consideration. This dispute itself was a full-length topic with unexpected ingredients shedding light on the amalgamation of general doctrine of proof and the *probatio theologica*. Let me cite just one example: if the conclusion drawn from human testimony by Port-Royal Logics is a rather not so certain knowledge, then the assertion that Peter was in Rome will just be the sentence taken as an *example* for the highest level of certainty that can ever be concluded from human testimony.<sup>89</sup> In Protestant logics, the negation of this sentence ("Petrus non fuit Romae") can be found as an example for a singular sentence.<sup>90</sup>

But back to Simon. The point which irritates the Protestants and which Spanheim focuses on in his criticism is the institutionalisation of the tradition in the course of Simon's theory of genesis *preceding* the Bible. Thus the Protestants were threatened by losing their argument of the temporal priority. That does not imply that the tradi-

---

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Spanheim d. J.: *Dissertatio de ficta profectioe Petri apostoli in urbem Romam deque non una traditionis origine* [1679], in: *ibid.*: *Operum* [...] Tomus II. Lugduni Batavorum 1703, pp. 331–388.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Antoine Arnauld (und Pierre Nicole): *La logique ou l'art de penser* [...] 1662, 1683]. Édition critique par Pierre Clair et Francois Girbal. Paris 1965, quat. part., chap. XIII, p. 342.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Johann Philipp Pareus (1576–1648): *Artis Logicae Libri Dvo: Ex optimis quibusque logicis perfectâ & accuratâ Methodo naturali* [...]. Hanoviae 1607, lib. II, cap. V, p. 211.

tion and the Bible were treated as equivalent, even less that the Roman bishop was pre-eminent, but in view of Simon's work—and much like what Thomasius' conceived dialogue urged them to do—the Protestants had their hands full to distinguish clearly, following the text of the New Testament: *Omnia probate, quod bonum est, tenete*. Spanheim tried to do so, pointing out<sup>91</sup> that Simon, new philological findings helping, was eager to find evidence for the (hermeneutically) insurmountable obscurity of the text.

This aims at the other Protestant maxim for the *probatio theologica*, i.e. the *claritas scripturae*. It is regarded one of the premises for both the *unitas sensus* and for the *certitudo* of the Bible and of the interpretation, which was repeatedly opposed to the *probabilitas* of the (purely human) *opiniones*. Here Spanheim recognised the most extreme point of view that, as he said, destroyed the “certitude & évidence” of the Holy Bible. To Spanheim's mind, everything Simon has to offer is either his rules of criticism or the prejudices (“préjugés de la Tradition”). This aimed at the distinction indicated with Simon between the *philologist*—who is ‘unbiased’ and ‘unprejudiced’, who, following the rules of criticism and common sense (“sur les règles ordinaires de la Critique, & sur le bon sens”), examined the text<sup>92</sup> and treats it (in tendency) as if it was nothing but the work of human tradition—and the *theologian*, who Simon explicitly denies to be.

Although generally appreciating Sixtus of Siena's (Senensius, 1520–1569) *Bibliotheca Sancta*, Simon criticised Sixtus for submitting still too much to the authority of the church in questions of criticism and grammar of the Holy Bible. With reference to this, Spanheim feared that the Father might make his “Critique & Grammaire” “la maitresse & le juge de sens” of the Holy Bible.<sup>93</sup> As a matter of fact, the philologist's approach with his ‘rules of criticism’ repeatedly showed—intentionally or not—that the text of the Holy Bible hardly met the prerequisites for the *probatio theologica* in the Protestant sense. Although the goal was to achieve *certitudo* as a norm, only the tradition, and in the end the (infallible) *magisterium*,<sup>94</sup> would be accomplished, according to Simon.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Spanheim: Lettre (footnote 17), p. 568: “[. . .] l'obscurité insurmontable [. . .].”

<sup>92</sup> Cf. e.g. (Simon): Réponse (footnote 26), p. 652.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Spanheim: *ibid.*, p. 609.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. *ibid.*: “Ce ne sera plus à l'écriture, puis que la Religion n'en dépend pas,

In Spanheim's view, Simon's examination read like "l'art de douter des vérités fondamentales de la Religion Chrétien", and he conceded that he preferred works that dispel his doubts or avoid them and thus confirming his confidence in the Holy Bible.<sup>95</sup> Nonetheless he recognised that Simon regarded the rules of criticism as rules of creation also, which were supposed to help restore the original text of the holy books, the basis of these rules being "une autre idée de la Langue Hébraïque". Therefore, the plan of the restitution—as one could add—did not *only* follow the uncertain tradition of the text and the testifiers as *argumenta inartificialis*, but its basis was to be the *proficient* arguments inferred from the language itself. This is a conclusion from Cappel's methodology. In Spanheim's view, this made the Bible independent from religion, submit it to nothing but criticism and grammar, which were in turn independent from the (doctrines of the) church.<sup>96</sup>

I am closing now. The distinction between the truth of the sense and the true sense formed the basis of the *hermeneutica generalis*, which arised in the middle of the 17th century and which developed following the *hermeneutica sacra*. In the beginning, however, no room for doubt was left that for the *hermeneutica sacra* the following two *canones* apply without restriction: *a falsitate rei ad falsitatem interpretationis* and *a falsitate consectoriorum legitimorum ad falsitatem interpretationis*. However much the philologisation of looking into the Holy Bible may have also been determined and furthered by the maxim of equal treatment—it comes up against its limit as soon as the quality of truth of the Holy Bible was submitted to this maxim. Spinoza explicitly rejected these special *canones* of the *hermeneutica sacra*, and for him no other than the rules of general hermeneutics apply to the interpretation of the Holy Bible—resulting in what shocked his contemporaries so deeply. It is exactly this maxim that Hermann Witsius (1636–1708), a famous Dutch theologian of his time, refers to when he worked his way up to the rhetoric question: If you, Hobbes, you, Spinoza, you, LeClerc, you, Simon, see anything divine in the composition of the Pentateuch, why do you then talk about it as if you

---

selon le Pere [Simon]; & qu'ainsi il n'y a point d'obligation précise à s'y rapporter, ou à s'y renir. Ce fera donc à la pure autorité indépendante de l'Ecriture."

<sup>95</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 569.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. *ibid.*: "[...] que le Religion, selon le Pere, est indépendante de l'Ecriture; cette Ecriture sujette à la Critique & à la Grammaire [...], & cette Critique & cette Grammaire ndépendantes de l'Eglise."

do about Xenophon or Thucydides, about Polybius or Livius' stories? But if you do see nothing divine in these writings, why do you play a part, why don't you throw off your mask?<sup>97</sup>

Simon's reaction to Spanheim's statements, which was written as the paper of a third person, but which may almost certainly be attributed to him; it is brusque and not without venom, which can be seen e.g. when he regrets having written his work in a language that everybody can read.<sup>98</sup> There may have been different reasons for this reaction, and Spanheim certainly attributed some opinions to Simon (in the hurry), which were not backed by the text; for instance, Simon depicted writing and collecting of the Genesis as an authorising act of Moses. However, another reason might have been the fact that Spanheim's criticism of Simon was centred upon the maxim of equal treatment and that, in this context, he warned Simon not to get in with Spinoza<sup>99</sup>—in a roundabout way though, but in fact not unjustly as we have seen. Spanheim was not the only one to do so. Isaak Vossius, himself harshly criticised by Simon, reproached him for the same reason.<sup>100</sup> Simon used Spanheim's allusion as an opportunity to counter, claiming his work had already been published in 1669 and thus it could not have been influenced by Spinoza. Simon had doubtlessly read *Tractatus* and neither is there any doubt that at least not the whole text might have been published in 1669. Later on, Simon repeatedly fought this reproach, conceding that there were similarities, though, but that the conclusions drawn from certain findings were decisive—and that the conclusions were not similar at all.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Witsius: *Miscellaneorum sacrorum libri IV* [... 1692]. Editio secunda [...]. Lygdvni Batvorvm 1695, p. 116.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. (Simon): Réponse (footnote 26), p. 625: “[...] & le plus garnd crime, à mon avis, que le Pere Simon ait commis, est d'avoir écrit son Livre en une Langue entendue en peuple.”

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Spanheim: Lettre (footnote 17), p. 573: “[...] sur les mêmes fondamens de cet Adversaire mouveau & trop connu des Auteurs Sacrés [...]].”

<sup>100</sup> Cf. e.g. Simon: *Histoire Critique* (footnote 17), Preface de l'Auteur, \*\*\*\*3: “Enfin, Mr. Vossius, qui n'a pô-souffrir l'ignorance de quelques Protestans, ausquels il donne la qualité de demi-Juifs, a entrepris dans un Ouvrage particulier la défense de la Version des Septante: mais sous prétexte de rejeter les Exemplaires de la Massore, il a passé dans une autre extrêmité à l'égard des Septante; de-sorte qu'on peut dire, qu'il y a peu de personnes qui soient capables de garder le milieu qui est nécessaire pour trouver la verité”, also: *ibid.*, liv. II, chap. IV, pp. 204–208, and liv. III, chap. XX, pp. 479/80.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. also John D. Woodbridge: *Richard Simon's Reaction to Spinoza's 'Tractatus Theologico-Politicus'*, in: *Spinoza in der Frühzeit seiner religiösen Wirkung*, ed. Karlfried Gründer and Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann. Heidelberg 1984, pp. 201–226.

We cannot go into this, but Simon was probably right. At least judging by the way he saw himself (and he made a point of doing this), he—in view of the prevailing doubts about the authorship of the Pentateuch and without abandoning the core dogmas of his confession—seemed to succeed in articulating a theory of origin which in any case holds more non-supernatural explanatory power than any of the numbers of contemporary dictation and inspiration theories of more or less orthodox theologians of both Protestant confessions. It is, as it were, an attempt at adopting the philological criticism, but moderating it in its consequences and thus bringing out the harmony of philological findings and Catholic devoutness with the help of a comparatively subtle theory of origin. It is only a brief reminder that Simon's contemporaries and brothers in faith did not yet agree with him. Only more than a hundred years later, then rather as his 'opponents in faith', they did. After all, the maxim of equal treatment is no more than a maxim that accompanying presumptions can toned down in its disastrous consequences for the theological reflections on the Holy Bible.<sup>102</sup> Johann August Ernesti (1707–1781), who influenced the *philologia sacra* more than anyone else in the second half of the 18th century, provided an example. On the one hand he articulates this maxim without restrictions, on the other hand he created a hermeneutic regulation for the Holy Bible that allows him to unquestioningly hold to the truth of what the authors of the New Testament wrote.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>102</sup> Christianity not Mysterious: Or, a Treatise Showing, That there is nothing in the Gospel Contrary to Reason, Not Above it: And that no Christian Doctrine can be properly call'd a Mystery. London 1696 (ND New York, London 1978), sect II, ch. 3, § 22, p. 49, by John Toland (1670–1722), who was probably also influenced by Spinoza in this respect, reads: “[. . .] all Men will own the Verity I defend if they read the sacred Writings with that Equity and Attention that is due to mere Human Works: Nor is there any different Rule to be follow'd in the Interpretation of Scripture from what is common to all other Books.” Ezechieel Spanheim writes a testimonial for him, which smoothes his way to the courts of Hanover and Berlin, cf. *ibid.*: Letters to Serena. London 1904, and *ibid.*: Relation des cours de Prusse et de Hanovre [. . .] La Haye 1706.

<sup>103</sup> Ernesti : Institutio Interrpetis Novi Testamenti [1761]. Editio Quarta. Havniae 1776, part. I, sect. 1, cap. 1, § 16, p. 12: “Et quoniam haec omnia communia sunt libris diuinis et humanis; patet, non alio modo vel quaeri vel reperiri sensum verborum in libris sacris, quod humana opera intercedit, quam quo in humanis vel solet vel debet, nec villo modo audiendos esse Fanaticos, qui, contemptis studiis linguarum et doctrinae, omnia ad vim diuinam Spiritus S. referunt: quamquam non est dubitandum, viros pios et veritatis divinae cupidos adiuuari a Spiritu Dei in scrutando scripturae sensu, in iis quidem rebus, quae proprie ad fidem et mores pertineant.”

Spanheim stopped publishing anything about the dispute on Richard Simon; Simon in turn wrote a second reply to him.<sup>104</sup> Those who took up the challenge include Jean LeClerc (Clericus, 1657–1736), whom Witsius mentioned in one breath with Spinoza and Simon. Not only did this result in heated arguments between himself and Simon; it made some Protestants wonder whether the two opponents' views were not quite the same. Rambach pigeonholed Clericus along with Cappel and Simon—and this not only in view of the authorship of Moses, although in his 1693 *Dissertatio de Scripturae pentateuchi Mose* Clericus revoked his doubts about the authorship of Moses, for whatever reasons. In his *Ars Critica* of 1697, he also saw the process of transformation of the written version of the Holy Bible under the same (human) circumstances as given in other manuscripts. Since the Hebrew scribes are human beings like the Greek or Latin ones, they should be granted *unintentional* mistakes:<sup>105</sup> “Cum Habraeorum Librarii, aut Scribae, homines essent, quemadmodum Graecorum aut Latinorum, menda similia admittebant.”<sup>106</sup> Therefore, there is no need to put a supposedly corrupt tradition down to the assumption of intentional falsification,<sup>107</sup> which is always possible, but which threatens to shatter any possibility to draw conclusions from a present traditional testimony for the distrust of the testifiers and to lead towards a universal hermeneutic philological scepticism. But more still: in the very introduction of his *Ars Critica* Clericus makes a distinction regarding his objective. This point is not, he says, to ascertain the truth of the examined writings, but only their authentic

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Simon: Réponse particulière à Spanheim [1686], in: Lettres choisies [. . .]. Nouv. éd. Tom. II. Rotterdam 1704, pp. 279–332.

<sup>105</sup> Cappellus: *Critica sacra* (footnote 47), lib. I, cap. 1, p. 5, rules out the intentional falsification and puts the differences down to human infirmitas, indiligentia, ignorantia, but also somnolentia.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Clericus: *Ars Critica* In qua ad studia linguaum Latinae, Graecae, et Hebraicae via munitur [. . . 1697]. Editio Quarta auctior & emendatior [. . .]. Vol. secundum. Amstelaedami 1712, [Pars III], sec. I, De emendatione, pp. 1–301; and Simon: *Histoire Critique* (footnote 17), I, 1, p. 8; Spanheim sees this, too, cf. *ibid.*: Lettre (footnote 17), p. 571: “[. . .] que celle-ci [i.e. the holy texts] n’a rien eu de plus singulier ou de plus exact, que l’on ne trouve, à son avis, dans les anciens Critiques des Ouvrages Grecs ou latins: [. . .].” Later he refers to copyists mixing up things, which stimulated the new critics: “changer & transposer hardiment dans ces Livres Sacrés, ce qui leur semble ne s’accorder pas avec l’ordre des choses, ou bien avec le jugement qu’ils en font.”

<sup>107</sup> Also cf. (Simon): Réponse (footnote 26), p. 636, where Vossius is accused of having unnecessarily (“pas nécessaire”) accused the Jews of having maliciously (“malicieusement”) falsified the text of the Holy Bible.

status and their true sense—in other words: the application of nothing but the rules of general hermeneutics to the Holy Bible.<sup>108</sup>

Ezechieel Spanheim presented *Ars Critica* directly after its publication on his conferences.<sup>109</sup> However, there is no evidence that he said a word about maxim of equal treatment articulated with Clericus in this context. Ezechieel and LeClerc were friends,<sup>110</sup> but does that mean that he followed LeClerc, who was himself accused of hermeneutic Spinozism? I do not think so.

---

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Clericus: *Ars Critica* [. . . 1697]. Vol. primum. Amstelaedami 1712, Praefatio, sec. I, § 2, pp. 3f.: “Critica [. . .] non attingit Grammaticas Regulas, quae sunt sermonis elementa; sed eas jam dudum notas esse legentibus statuit. Neque etiam rerum ipsarum cognitionem suppediat, se viam tantum aperit, ad intelligendum eorum sermonem, qui de rebus egerunt. Haud magis quaeritur hic quid verum sit, quid falsum, seu an id quod legimus Veritati consentaneum sit, necne; sed dumtaxat quum possimus intelligere quid sibi velint ii, quorum scripta versamus. Uno verbo, quaeritur vera dictorum sentantia, non veritas eorum quae dicuntur, licet huic illa facem saepe praeferat; cum, nempe, Scriptor, quem intelligimus, Veritatem adsequutus est.” LeClerc, in his: *Sentiments de quelques théologiens d’Hollande sur L’Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament composée par le P. Rich. Simon de l’Oratoire*. Amsterdam 1685, replies to Simon that the historical books of the Old Testament should be treated like the ancient ones; of course, he tries to combine that with a providential orientation that the credibility could not be ascertained differently from with other ‘historians’.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Kvačala: *Die Spanheim-Conferenz* (footnote 5), p. 35.

<sup>110</sup> Cf.: *Joannis Clerici [. . .] Vita & Opera Ad Annum MDCCXI*. Amici Ejus Opusculum, Philosophicis Clerici Operibus Subjiciendum. Amstelodami 1711, pp. 195–244.



TEMPORIZING AFTER BAYLE:  
ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE AND THE MANICHEANS

John Christian Laursen

One of the most influential publications by a Huguenot author in Berlin of the first half of the eighteenth century was the 1400-page *Critical History of Manichée and Manicheanism* (1734–39) of Isaac de Beausobre (1659–1738). Manicheanism was one of the most important heresies in the history of world religion, and the treatment of heresy is a litmus test of where someone stands on issues ranging from the status of knowledge and toleration of the “other” to scholarship and war.<sup>1</sup> Beausobre’s book provides us with insights into the changing understanding of heresy in the eighteenth century that eventually led to the situation today when we have forgotten these heresies, although they live on beneath the surface in our collective imaginations.

Voltaire wrote that Beausobre’s book was “one of the most profound, the most curious, and the best written” of all books; called the author “the most tolerant of all the Christians”; and had a character in *Candide* say, “I am a Manichean”.<sup>2</sup> The *Critical History* was one of the sources of Edward Gibbon’s idea that it was the blending of pagan philosophy and Christian theology that caused the downfall of the Roman Empire, and that the medieval Manicheans were a healthy challenge to the Church.<sup>3</sup> It is easy to believe that

---

<sup>1</sup> See J. C. Laursen (ed.): *Histories of Heresy in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Palgrave 2002.

<sup>2</sup> *Siècle de Louis XIV* in *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire*, ed. L. Moland. Paris: Garnier 1878 (vol. 14), p. 39; *Correspondance*, ed. T. Besterman. Paris: Gallimard 1975 (vol. 3), p. 687 [B3210]. On *Candide*, see Richard Popkin: *Manicheanism in the Enlightenment*, in: *The Critical Spirit*, eds. K. Wolff and B. Moore, Jr. Boston: Beacon Press 1967, pp. 45–49. Voltaire also copied passages of Beausobre’s work into his *Questions sur l’Encyclopedie*: see B. Schwarzbach: *Politics and Ethics in the Huguenot Diaspora: Isaac de Beausobre in Berlin*, in: *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. J. C. Laursen. Leiden: Brill 1995, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> See J. G. A. Pocock: *Barbarism and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999 (vol. 1), pp. 66, 86, 122–5, 234, 264; (vol. 2), pp. 384–8. See also Popkin: *Manicheanism in the Enlightenment*, pp. 43–4.

Crown Prince Frederick's admiration for Beausobre played a role in the future Frederick the Great's dour, ascetic, and neo-Manichean view of the world.<sup>4</sup>

In this chapter, I situate Beausobre in the intellectual panorama of the day, in what has recently been called variously the Religious Enlightenment, the Conservative Enlightenment, and the Moderate Enlightenment. I explore Beausobre's place in the beneficial lies controversies; his attitude toward nationalism, tolerance, and hate; and his understanding of the republic of letters, religion, and philosophy. I review his reactions to Baruch de Spinoza, Pierre Bayle, the Comte de Boulainvilliers, and other 17th and 18th century figures. Finally, I sketch his place at the root of a tradition that includes many of the members of the francophone Prussian Academy and is also recognizable in German-speaking Berlin writers like Moses Mendelssohn.

I have titled this chapter "Temporizing After Bayle" because it seems to me that one of the chief goals of intellectuals like Beausobre was to harvest the fruits of Spinoza's and Bayle's critical history and critical method without accepting the radical implications that could be drawn from their work. By "temporizing" I mean yielding to the currents of the day so as to gain time; compromising in order to delay changes that are underway. The intellectual project of Beausobre and of many others was to carve out a right of Protestant intellectuals to engage in critical scholarship and at the same time slow down the declining legitimacy of church and state.

Reasons for this deradicalizing element in Beausobre's thought can be found in his biography. Unsettled times and an unsettled personal situation may have provoked the famous Huguenot writer Pierre Bayle's iconoclasm and radical challenging of all positions, and others like him. But by the time Beausobre was writing his *magnum opus*, things had calmed down for many Huguenots. After fleeing from France in 1683 and serving as chaplain to the princess of Anhalt in Dessau from 1686 to 1693, Beausobre moved to Berlin in 1695, where he served as pastor of the main French Church until his death in 1738.<sup>5</sup> He also served in other such honorable posts as director

---

<sup>4</sup> See Popkin: Manicheism in the Enlightenment, pp. 44–46.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Haag, E. Haag: *La France protestante* (186). Repr. Geneva: Slatkine 1966 (vol. 2), pp. 123ff.

of the Maison français and Inspector of all the French churches in Berlin. He had a first and second wife and five children and was a pillar of the community. The church and state in Prussia gave Beausobre a living and defended him from Catholic persecution. He did not want to upset and provoke, but rather to stabilize and defend.

One of the things that Beausobre wanted to defend was the intellectual freedom of what was then known as the “Republic of Letters”. Beausobre’s lifelong literary project was the defense of the Reformation. His first book was entitled *Defense de la Doctrine des Réformez sur la Providence, sur la prédestination, sur la grâce, et sur la eucharistie* (1693). His third was a translation of the *New Testament* into French, written with Jacques Lenfant (1718). In sheer bulk, however, his vindications of all sorts of people persecuted as heretics made up the largest part of his work, and can surely be called the product of a lifelong crusade, if not obsession. After his death, 4 volumes of his manuscripts were published as a *Histoire de la Réformation* (1785–86), and he left manuscripts on the “History of the Pauliciens”, “History of the Bogomils”, “History of the Albigensians”, and more.<sup>6</sup> He published a “Dissertation on the Adamites of Bohemia” in the journal *Bibliothèque germanique*. And the work we shall be reviewing here, *Critical History of Manichée and Manicheanism*, came out in two volumes, one of 594 dense pages, quarto, of 1734 and the second of 806 pages, edited from his manuscripts by his friend J. H. S. Formey (1739).<sup>7</sup>

### 1. *Nuances of Enlightenment*

There was a time when scholars regularly wrote of “The Enlightenment”. Then came “Enlightenment in national context”, including the Scottish Enlightenment, the Swiss Enlightenment, the Neapolitan Enlightenment, and so forth.<sup>8</sup> If we were to follow this line, we would

---

<sup>6</sup> See Frédéric Hartweg: Le Grand Beausobre: Aspekte des intellektuellen und kirchlichen Lebens der ersten Generation des Berliner *Refuge*, in: *Geschichte als Aufgabe*, ed. W. Treue. Berlin: Colloquium 1988, pp. 55–81.

<sup>7</sup> *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (Amsterdam: Frederic Bernard, 1734–39; repr. New York: Garland, 1984 and Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat, 1970). Hereafter cited in parentheses from the Garland reprint; vol. 2 is cited with a “II.” preceding the page number.

<sup>8</sup> *The Enlightenment in National Context*, eds. Roy Porter, M. Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1981.

have to place Beausobre in a Berlin Enlightenment, although he had correspondents in many countries and his book was published in Amsterdam. Or we might place him in a French Reformed or Huguenot Enlightenment, perhaps jazzing it up into a Huguenot International.

In reaction to this splintering of the Enlightenment along national boundaries, some scholars insisted that we should reserve the word for the “High Enlightenment” based in Paris, hitting its stride after 1750.<sup>9</sup> Others, noting that this would exclude all but a handful of figures, all French and mostly radical, have called for more nuance in the discussion of many Enlightenments. John Pocock has labeled the gentry and clergymen involved in Enlightenment the “Conservative Enlightenment”, to be understood in contrast to the political, social, and religious rebels.<sup>10</sup> David Sorkin has followed German-speaking churchmen and other thinkers in a “Religious Enlightenment” as opposed to the irreligious Enlighteners.<sup>11</sup> Jonathan Israel has recently distinguished a “Moderate Enlightenment” from the Spinozists and atheists of the “Radical Enlightenment”.<sup>12</sup>

I am going to show that Beausobre was conservative in some matters; that he was indeed religious; and that he was moderate as opposed to radical in some matters. But he does not fall exactly into any of the foregoing dichotomies. His case calls for further nuance not provided by any of the just-mentioned authors precisely because he was fighting a three-front war. On the one side were the Catholics. The Jansenist Pascal had written that “the Manicheans were the ancient Lutherans and the Lutherans are the modern Manicheans” and the Catholic Bishop Bossuet had claimed that the Manicheans were the ancestors of the Protestants.<sup>13</sup> On the second side were other Protestants, ranging from the hard-line Huguenots like Pierre Jurieu, who called for intolerance and holy war against Catholics

---

<sup>9</sup> Robert Darnton: *George Washington’s False Teeth*, in: *New York Review of Books*, March 27, 1997.

<sup>10</sup> J. G. A. Pocock: *Conservative Enlightenment and Democratic Revolutions*, in: *Government and Opposition* 24 (1989), pp. 81–105.

<sup>11</sup> David Sorkin: *Reform Catholicism and Religious Enlightenment*, in: *Austrian History Yearbook* 30, 1999, pp. 187–219; Jan David Sorkin: *Moses Mendelssohn and the Religious Enlightenment*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1996.

<sup>12</sup> Jonathan Israel: *Philosophy and Radical Enlightenment the Making of Modernity, 1650–1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001.

<sup>13</sup> Popkin: *Manicheanism in the Enlightenment*, pp. 32–33. Beausobre calls Bossuet “one of the geniuses of the age, but also one of the greatest declaimers and one of the greatest sophists of our day” (526).

and heretics alike, to Lutherans involved in confessional polemics with Beausobre's fellow Calvinists. On the third side were the libertines and radical enlighteners inspired by Spinoza and Bayle, who revelled in the difficulties with orthodox theology raised by the Manicheans. The one-two punch of Spinoza and Bayle was enough to destroy all traditional legitimacy for many.

Beausobre was caught in the middle. With him, we have a case study of what it can mean to believe you are middle-of-the-road, "balanced", and by your own standard "objective". The ideal reader he appeals to is "an equitable reader, without being a partisan of heresy, who loves nothing but justice and truth" (44). The Catholics, Jurieu, Spinoza, and Bayle were playing with fire, but Beausobre set out with the sober task of throwing water on all fires.

## 2. *Manicheism*

Mani, also known as Manes or Manichée, was the third-century A.D. founder of Manicheism, a heresy condemned by the branches of Christian theology and authority that succeeded in becoming orthodox Christianity. St. Augustine embraced it at first but then turned against it. It did not go away, however, and various elements of it thrived in later heretical movements such as the Bogomils, Albigensians, and Cathars of the 13th and 14th centuries. It spread as far as China.<sup>14</sup> Writers as opposed to each other as Bishop Bossuet and Pierre Bayle had kept this heresy on the agenda in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.

Mani and his followers were the people who thought that there are two gods or two principles that run the world. Their reasoning was that an entirely good and perfect god would not have made the mess we see around us, so that there must be an evil principle, too. This was a threat because it was the great counter-system to the monotheism of what emerged as orthodox Christianity. It is not too much to say that the spirit of Manicheism survives wherever extreme dualisms live on today.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> S. N. C. Lieu: *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden: Brill 1994; S. N. C. Lieu: *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. Leiden: Brill 1998.

<sup>15</sup> See Hans Jonas: *The Gnostic Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press 1963, pp. 320–40, for the case that Heidegger and existentialism can be considered Manichean dualism.

Beausobre's chief strategy was to go back to Mani's time and place to see what the available intellectual resources were (e.g. 473, 525, 561, 588). In the process, he shows that most of the Church Fathers held the same or worse heretical views, as did Plato, assorted Jews, Zoroaster, and almost everyone else. He also shows that the Manicheans were on the right side of many issues: it is false that everything that a heretic thinks is a heresy (556, 573). This allows him to place many contemporaries in a dilemma: if you oppose Spinoza and Spinozism, you agree with Mani; if you are in favor of clerical celibacy (II.474, 483) and believe that the earth is spherical, you agree with Mani; if you oppose the view that God is a liar, you agree with Mani.

One of the implications of two principles was that the Manicheans divided the world into good and evil, and there could be no grounds for mutual coexistence, cooperation, or tolerance. This model of the world has been behind much aggressive and intolerant thinking ever since. It is a major paradox that this much-persecuted sect developed and left us the mental equipment that has justified so much violence and persecution. Beausobre is best understood as profoundly anti-Manichean precisely because he opposed the stark dichotomies that they promoted. He was writing neither to save, redeem, or fully vindicate, nor to vilify, damn, or curse, but rather to understand and explain. At the end of the book, Mani is still a heretic and some of his ideas are still wrong. But he and his ideas are not as bad as some people have said, and not deserving of violence. Paradoxically, Beausobre's study of the Manicheans has the effect of promoting a tolerant, non-Manichean attitude toward heretics and heresies.

### 3. *Liars and impostors*

Beausobre's chief strategy in our *Critical History* was to show that the early Greek and Latin Catholic authors of historical materials about Mani were "full of ignorance, lies, and absurdities" (6), which were contradicted by Syrian, Persian, and Arab authors. The contrast between the two sets of sources served to defend Mani and Manicheanism against Catholic slander without vindicating them across the board.

The ancient Greek and Latin authors are portrayed by Beausobre in a uniformly negative light. The chief early Latin source is the *Acta Disputationis Archelai*. This purports to be the record of a debate

between Mani and the Catholic bishop Archelaus. Beausobre quotes the text at length, with notes to errors, frauds, and impostures (10–16). Then his own text proceeds to bring out all its contradictions and errors for dozens of pages, asserting time and again that the evidence suggests that it is a fabrication. Along the way, Beausobre accuses St. Epiphany and Cyril of Jerusalem of “exaggerations, inexactitudes, and bad faith” (42). Photius has the temerity to write of things “that it is certain he never saw” (48). The Greek and Latin ancients “abused with too much license the credulity of the vulgar Catholics” (57). The “Greeks employed indifferently the false and the true, as long as it worked to flay the memory of the heretics” (68). This is bad, Beausobre writes, because too much eagerness to discredit others by the use of pious frauds will undermine belief in Christianity when those frauds are exposed (4).

Rough linguistic analysis indicates something of the importance of the theme of lies and imposture in Beausobre’s book. The words “imposture” and “impostor”, “lies” and “liars”, “calumny”, “false”, and “fraud” are used scores of times. The overall impression of reading Beausobre’s texts is that almost everybody lies and impostors are everywhere. He uncovers pious frauds throughout his sources, confounding each one with evidence from the others (e.g., 44, 52). He is still talking about lies and pious frauds much later in the second volume (II.567, 756).

This obsession with lies and impostors was widespread in Beausobre’s time. Almost everybody was accusing everyone else of impostorship and lies, and it was becoming very hard to sort out the truth. The impostorship theme has been well-documented in recent scholarship: the first printed version of the *Tract on the Three Impostors* had come out in 1719, but that was only the tip of the iceberg.<sup>16</sup>

Mani was a hard-line moral rigorist. One of the chief motivations for his theology was the idea that God must be perfect in every way, and that implies that he is not a liar. The prevailing interpretation of some confusing Greek in the Bible was that “The devil is a liar, son of a liar” (John VIII, 44) (105, II.263). There must be two principles at work in the world, Mani says, because if God had created

---

<sup>16</sup> See: Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and Free Thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe, eds. S. Berti, F. Charles-Daubert, R. Popkin. Dordrecht: Kluwer 1996; *The Treatise of the Three Impostors and the Problem of Enlightenment*, ed. Abraham Anderson. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield 1997.

the devil, the devil would be his offspring and thus God would be a liar, which is an impiety (105).

One way of restoring monism in the face of Mani's challenge is paradoxical. It is to admit that God may lie, albeit for beneficial purposes. Remarkably enough, this was the solution of one famous theologian of Beausobre's day, Jacques Saurin.<sup>17</sup> It is probably not by chance that the manuscript of the first volume of our *Critical History* was dated 30 May, 1731, just at the time of the controversy that Saurin provoked. Saurin wrote that God and Jesus Christ indeed tell lies at several points in the Bible, but concluded that what this proves is that beneficial lying is permitted in some cases. His idea was suppressed because the self-proclaimed orthodox thought that this position was scandalous. It is a further paradox that if you agree with the orthodox position, you are agreeing with Mani. Beausobre's own solution is to insist that we should not hypostatize the nature of God. We do not know enough about him, so do not take a stand on whether God can lie or not.

All of this lying could be taken one way by Voltaire, who could think that it undermined the Church; and another way by libertines, who could think that it justified Machiavellian lying on everybody's part. But Beausobre remained a moralist. It was not the case that absolutely everybody lied or had to lie: "one should not be neutral between truth and error" (II.4). It was a scholar's duty to separate the wheat from the chaff, to identify the lies and confirm the truths. Thus, Beausobre could conserve Protestant doctrines as he refuted Manichean and Catholic lies.

#### 4. *Hate and nationalism*

Beausobre makes it clear that he is not going to defend the Manicheans across the board. They hold "an opinionated and desperate heresy"; they are "frivolous", "vain", "impudent", and in "bad faith" (II.523-4). But this does not mean that the proper response to them is hate.

---

<sup>17</sup> J. C. Laursen: The Beneficial Lies Controversy in the Huguenot Netherlands, 1705-1731, in: *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* vol. 319 (1994), pp. 67-103; *Impostors and Liars: Clandestine Manuscripts and the Limits of Freedom of the Press in the Huguenot Netherlands*, in: *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. Laursen, pp. 73-100.



Beausobre is writing in order to promote a change in attitude toward error and heresy. The real problem with accepting all the slanders against the heretics is what it does to the orthodox. It creates “a hate for their persons which stifles, in the heart of the orthodox, all sentiments of compassion, charity, and humanity itself, and converts them into cruel persecutors” (2). It is better to “relieve ourselves of that ancient and inveterate hate of the heretics” in order to analyze what they really might have said (59). Too many of the ancients were motivated by “blind prejudice, inspired by hate” (257). In his debate with chief orthodox opponent, Mani “always maintains the character of a sweet, patient, and modest man” (97). The Catholic bishop in alleged debate with him, who “grinds his teeth” and “roars like a lion” when he hears of the heresies of Mani, has more of the appearance of a heretic than Mani, Beausobre observes (108). More than once, Beausobre points out that “the Manicheans are modest and reserved compared to the Catholics” (II.584).

Beausobre is well aware of the power of nationalism in determining the status of heretics. The real crime for which Mani was eventually executed by the King of Persia was that he had become a Christian. This would threaten the livelihood of the Persian magi (187, 202), and in addition Christianity was associated with the Romans, their enemies (86, 183, 187). Correspondingly, Manicheanism, coming from a Persian, was equally suspect to the Romans and their Greek subjects (183, 542). Mani was caught in a whipsaw.

Beausobre points out that the Syrians, Persians, and Arabs all hated Mani as much as the Greeks and Latins, so it was not because they were supporting him that they did not support the evidence of the Greeks (155). Western writers such as the Abbé Renaudet reveal nothing but a national partiality when they trust the historians of their own nation rather than those of other nations (156). But Beausobre would rather rely on historians talking about their own country (i.e. Persians on Mani) than historians writing from far away and from other languages (Greeks on Mani) (156).

He was a Chaldean, so “it is not surprising that Mani preferred the theology and philosophy of his own nation to that of the Hebrews” (313 [misnumbered 393]). Augustine’s opposition can be attributed to his nationalism: steeped in Latin literature, he did not read Persian, Greek, or Syriac and did not have direct access to the Manichean sources and, ambitious as he admitted to be, could not expect a brilliant career in that field (426, 437).

In answer to nationalism, Beausobre makes what we would now call the argument from cultural relativity. The Greeks claimed Mani's name was barbarous and meant "furious", but Beausobre, taking the position of the "other", answers that words that sound barbarous to Greeks may sound beautiful to the people who use them (70). The Greeks make fun of Mani for the bright colors of his clothing when dignified philosophers should dress in brown or black, but Beausobre points out that "our usages are arbitrary, and do not prescribe to other peoples" (98).

Similarly, in order to demean him hostile biographers had claimed that Mani was born a slave. Beausobre has two answers to that. One is that many great philosophers such as Zoroaster and Epictetus were slaves, and the other that the evidence showed that he was the son of a magus or priest (69).

Nationalism is bad enough, but it can be trumped by religious hate. Mani is rightly suspicious of efforts by Catholics to debate with him, Beausobre writes, because "the hate of Catholics for the heterodox perhaps surpasses that of the Romans against the Persians" (96).

Beausobre's solution to the problems of nationalism and hate was the irenic claim that "we should treat heretics as we would want them to treat us" (525). "The equitable person does not have two scales nor two measures: one for his friends and one for his enemies" (525).

### 5. *Beausobre's religion*

On Jonathan Israel's scale, Christians are conservatives or moderates, but deists and atheists are radicals. Voltaire wrote to Formey in 1752 that "it is evident that [Beausobre] is a deist, at least evident to me".<sup>18</sup> A later author has called him a "Christian deist".<sup>19</sup> So we need to say something about Beausobre's religion in order to characterize him with accuracy. On several occasions, Beausobre gives us his *credo*: "I regard as fundamental truths that God created the world . . . and that he governs it by his providence" (II.240). His life-time of writing, preaching, and administering the church certainly

---

<sup>18</sup> Voltaire, *Correspondance*, ed. T. Besterman. Paris: Gallimard 1975 (vol. 3), p. 572 (B3103).

<sup>19</sup> Popkin: *Manicheanism in the Enlightenment*, p. 52.

suggest piety. His texts do not lend themselves to the sort of between-the-lines reading that Bayle's and other subversive texts do. Unlike other clergymen scattered around Europe who left us manuscripts containing their doubts, he left us nothing of the sort. He was a sophisticated scholar, all along aware of the irreligious currents, but apparently not moved by them.

Is it suspect that Beausobre writes that "a common expedient of false prophets" is to pretend that one has been lifted up to heaven for some period of time (189)? Beausobre is discussing Mani's claim, and he does not mention Jesus here. He appears sincere when saying that "two great empires, that of the Arabs and that of the Mogols, had for their foundations two false prophets" (194). It is worth pointing out that if one believes a faith on the basis of a revelation, one can see parallel cases without thinking that they in any way undermine one's own faith.

Is it suspect that Beausobre summarizes the ancient Persian religion as "the purest that human reason has ever imagined" (161)? This is perfectly legitimate in Christian fideism, which insists that we need revelation in addition to reason.<sup>20</sup> Latitudinarians of many stripes could respect Zoroaster's religion, as Beausobre describes it, consisting of "the purest faith; sincerity and honesty in words; and justice and holiness in actions" (164). He gets in an anti-Catholic jibe: this wonderful religion has no images or statues except those consecrated to the Divinity (165).

When he writes that "the magi divided into different sects, but they were too wise and too moderate to anathematize each other and to persecute with fire and blood" (177), this is obviously a thinly veiled comment on too many Christians, not really a call to convert to Zoroastrianism.

Beausobre often uses the strategy of showing that the Catholics are worse than the heretics. Mani was an impostor, he admits, but not with evil intentions. He drew people away from idolatry and toward monotheism. Which is worse, abolishing idolatry or supposing an infinity of false miracles (Catholics!), Beausobre asks? (316 [misnumbered 396]). Catholics are always accusing heretics of things that they themselves do, he insists (339–341). They accuse the

---

<sup>20</sup> Michael Stausberg makes a similar point in: *Faszination Zarathushtra*. Berlin: de Gruyter 1998, p. 767; also asserting that "Beausobre's evaluation of Zoroastrianism emerges as astonishingly well-intentioned" (p. 775).

Manicheans of adoring the sun, but they adore the relics of martyrs (II.592ff.).

It is probably fair to say, as Pocock has, that Beausobre belonged to the liberal Protestantism “that was seeking to ally belief with criticism and faith with scepticism”, but there is no sign that for Beausobre as for Gibbon, it had led to the point that “critical freedom and the freedom to write history . . . substituted themselves for belief altogether” (Pocock, I.66). Rather, he uses his critical skills against the Catholics. In contrast to critique, Beausobre writes, the “general spirit of antiquity was constantly to admit, without examination, all that which rumor had published to [the heretics] disadvantage” (2). This had been picked up by modern figures like Tillemont, but, Beausobre ironizes, “I excuse nevertheless Mr. de Tillemont. Born and raised in the Roman Catholic Church, which has no defense or resource other than tradition, he feared to undermine a foundation that could not be shaken without ruining the whole edifice which it sustains” (2; cf. II.120). The anti-Catholicism is obvious in such statements as that “Infallibility is not the privilege of any mortal” (430).

The anti-Catholicism throughout the book could have at least two functions. One was polemical and directed to European-wide audiences: the defense of the Reformation from Catholic attack. The other was more irenic. Since there were not many Catholics in Beausobre’s immediate surroundings, we can interpret anti-Catholicism as a way of stressing an issue that the otherwise factious Protestants in his milieu could agree on. Reminding them of their enemies could help bring them together.

It is also worth observing that Beausobre’s irenicism did not stop him from engaging in inter-confessional polemics, even if he avoided stridency. His anti-Lutheran jabs remind us that he was self-consciously Calvinist. Writing a hundred years later, F. C. Baur accused him of “a certain one-sided apologetic tendency”, which should not be surprising in a sincerely religious writer.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Cited in: Sandra Pott: *Critica perennis. Zur Gattungsspezifik gelehrter Kommunikation im Umfeld der Bibliothèque Germanique (1720–1741)*, in: *Die Praktiken der Gelehrsamkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit*, eds. H. Zedelmaier, M. Mulsow. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2001, p. 256. See 262f. and 267f. on Beausobre’s anti-Lutheran polemics.

Reminded that some elements of Zoroastrianism were superstition, Beausobre asks, “doesn’t superstition make its way into almost every religion?” (322). The constant preference for tolerance and understanding of others—even the basic project of rehabilitating Mani—makes it clear that he is opposing the more intolerant Huguenots.

To counter the slanders, Beausobre turns Mani into a Christian martyr. When Archelaus charges that all Mani did to save the life of the heir to the throne was to pray, Beausobre comments: “In this matter he seems greater than I would want him to be. What could be more holy and magnanimous in a faithful disciple of Jesus Christ? But it is difficult to become the head of a sect without great qualities” (82). Beausobre’s religious feelings are also clear in his comments on the Pietist Gottfried Arnold, who goes too easy on real heretics, he says (240).

One of Beausobre’s strategies against Archelaus is to point out that some of his arguments, such as his Arian critique of Mani’s view of Christ’s person, are no less heresies than Mani’s view (114, see also 118–19). Archelaus expresses in effect the view of Cerinthe, the Ophites, and the Serpentinis, other much-damned heretics, Beausobre points out (115). Other defenses of Mani make him closer to the Protestants than the Catholics as a way of explaining their hostility: Catholic anti-Manicheism may be rooted in Manicheism’s hostility to “all cult of the dead, and of images” (78). It was also rooted in Mani’s claim that the earth is round, which Mani knew as a mathematician (158). For a long time that had been a heresy to the Catholics.

Beausobre occasionally retorts to the Catholic charge that Protestants are Manicheans that the facts show the opposite. One element of the true reason Mani was condemned was his aversion to marriage (213): in this matter the Catholics are the modern Manicheans (424). He is also careful to distance Mani from later Manicheans, such as the Cathars, by calling them “pretended Manicheans” (160).

Although, as I have mentioned, one scholar has called him a “Christian deist”,<sup>22</sup> this would ordinarily be considered an oxymoron because precisely the point of the people known as deists was that the God they found in nature was not the Christian God. In any

---

<sup>22</sup> Popkin: *Manicheism in the Enlightenment*, p. 52.

case, Beausobre did not sympathize with other so-called deists who figure in what has recently been called the “Radical Enlightenment”. We have contemporary records of a conversation concerning apocryphal and unreliable biblical texts that Beausobre had with the deist John Toland as early as 1701. Beausobre knows how to discuss dubious texts, but he also knows when Toland goes too far: he is moved finally to question the latter’s Christianity and sincerity.<sup>23</sup> Thus, calling Beausobre a deist would seem to be a way of referring to what others called latitudinarian or liberal Christians. We have seen above that he may have been something of a fideist, such that revelation is invoked to override reason, but this does not mean he was not a Christian.

A test of Beausobre’s sincerity can be found in one of his sources. In an effort to discredit Mani, his follower Scythien is described by several sources as an Arab. The implication was that his ideas are barbarous and uncouth, the product of an uncivilized desert. So Beausobre cites a recent *Life of Mohammed* on the high level of sophistication of the Arabs (20). The author of that book was the Comte de Boulainvilliers, whom we now know as the author of many deist and irreligious manuscripts, which might cast doubt on Beausobre’s sincerity. But since these were not published until much later, we can suspect that Beausobre did not know that. Jonathan Israel has recently reminded us that the radical Enlightenment was ambivalent about Islam, sometimes praising it as a way of attacking Christianity, and sometimes condemning it and then tarring Christians for being no better than Muslims.<sup>24</sup> In any case, we see here that a representative of the moderate, Christian Enlightenment could also use a tolerant attitude toward the Arabs as a way of attacking slanderers of Manicheism. He could add that Mohammed was a “famous impostor”, but that pinning heresy on Middle Eastern ethnic geography would only supply “libertines” with ammunition for attacking “the true religion” (22).

Many of the radicals were libertines. Making it clear that he is no sympathizer with libertines, he defends Mani against charges that he chose his religious principles in order to justify a voluptuous way

---

<sup>23</sup> J. P. Erman: *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de Sophie Charlotte reine de Prusse*. Berlin: 1801), pp. 200–211; discussed in: Justin Champion: *Introduction to John Toland, Nazarenus*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation 1999, pp. 10–13.

<sup>24</sup> Israel: *Radical Enlightenment*, pp. 571–3, 702–3.

of life. Voluptuaries usually prefer to doubt the existence of God and Providence, in order to leave them free to do what they want, Beausobre writes, rather than take on a complicated theology and its demanding duties (28). This is simply an example of the “malign and temerarious custom of looking for the origin of errors in disorders of the heart, which one finds more naturally and innocently in the obscurity in which God has been pleased to leave certain truths, and in the weakness of the human spirit” (29). Heresy is “a bottom, nothing but a weakness, an involuntary deviation of the spirit” (43).

### 6. *Philosophy and Fanaticism*

The Greek fathers tried to give everything Mani said or did “an air of imposture, or of fanaticism” (79). Every once in a while Beausobre observes that Mani was indeed an impostor (e.g. 108, 129, 189, 253) and perhaps a fanatic (e.g. 108, 186–7, 253), but the general drift of his argument is to vindicate him against Catholic charges. He was not as much of an impostor or fanatic as the ancient sources would have us believe (254).

By way of apology for Mani, Beausobre writes that his real mistake was a philosophical one. He relied too much on rationality, and left revelation too subservient to reason (94). The Manicheans are right that reason does not admit the dogma of resurrection; their fault is in not accepting that dogma on faith (166; II.5).

“Mani was a theologian and a philosopher”, and this was his downfall (466). Mani was a Platonist; Plato in turn got his ideas from the Pythagoreans, who got theirs from the Zoroastrian Magi (479, 494, 582). Platonism was the source of Valentinian gnosticism (575–6, 581, II.35). Gibbon was much impressed by Beausobre’s thesis that Platonism was the downfall of the Manicheans, and expanded it into the thesis that the mix of philosophy and Christianity corrupted the Roman Empire.

It is not that Beausobre is against philosophy; he is against the inappropriate appropriation of philosophy in theology. It is the mix that is volatile. “Metaphysical ideas about God are not appropriate for preachers who wish to instruct and correct a people” (272). Some errors, Beausobre cautions, are merely philosophical, not theological, and do not threaten religion (II.144, 240). He also regrets that “a philosopher fights with philosophers in a manner more generous

and magnanimous than the orthodox customarily treat the heretics” (237). True philosophers “maintain peace in spite of the diversity of their opinions, whereas [theologians] reciprocally anathematize each other” (528).

Among other persecuted heresies, Beausobre explores the innocent sources of Sabellianism, which evolved into the Socinianism of his own day. Beausobre concludes that impartiality and understanding of the causes of their errors are better at bringing heretics back into the orthodox fold than temerarious and irritating judgments about them (536). He defends the Socinians against charges that they are atheists (II.242). In 1699 the youthful Beausobre was a member of a tribunal that accused the young Barbeyrac of Socinianism,<sup>25</sup> but we may speculate that the older man who wrote the *Critical History of Manichée* had mellowed.

### 7. *Spinoza and Bayle*

Jonathan Israel has recently pointed out that Benedict de Spinoza and Pierre Bayle were litmus tests for the Radical Enlightenment.<sup>26</sup> Spinoza’s monism, materialism, anti-providentialism, and critique of miracles were seen as a threat to morals, religion, and society. Bayle, too, was accused of atheism and of undermining politics and society. Beausobre’s nuanced stance toward these two writers helps us see his position in the middle, neither supporting the radical implications of their ideas nor condemning them as heretics.

Beausobre follows his familiar practice of associating Spinozism with great names such as Aristotle and Plato (27, II.173, 230). If such greats are guilty of similar heresies and nevertheless excused, Mani does not deserve special opprobation. Beausobre also follows the alternative strategy of showing that Mani was on the right side against other heresies, and in this case was one of the chief opponents of Spinozistic monism. He quotes the historian of philosophy Buddeus, who supports the Manicheans against Spinozism (592).

---

<sup>25</sup> Discussed in: Pott: *Critica perennis*, pp. 265–7. Pott points out that Beausobre failed to respond to the fifth edition of Barbeyrac’s edition of Pufendorf’s *De Jure Naturae et Gentium* in 1734 (pp. 263–4). But failure to respond to someone’s work must be one of the lighter forms of intolerance, and without more evidence cannot be taken to prove that Beausobre retained intolerant views from the 1699 tribunal.

<sup>26</sup> Israel: *Radical Enlightenment*, passim.



Since Spinozism defends the existence of a single substance and the Manicheans insist on dualism, Beausobre can suggest that if you disagree with Spinozism, you are allied with the Manicheans (167ff.). The orthodox should think that it is a good thing that “all the heretics that believe in two substances cannot fall into Spinozism” and also “cannot be Arians” (518).

Anti-Trinitarians, known as Arians or Socinians, were one of the chief targets of the orthodox. They tend to become Spinozists, Beausobre reports, so if you are an anti-Socinian you should be glad that Manicheans oppose Spinoza (II.221–2). Jacques Basnage asserted that Pythagoras was a Spinozist on some issues, but Beausobre claims that you cannot be both a dualist, as Pythagoras was, and a Spinozist monist at the same time (II.153–5, 171–3). Hermes Trismegistus was a Manichean, but a Spinozist on the question of all things being in God; but this latter idea is not atheistic (II.203). The consubstantiality of God and nature is Spinozist, as are various Cabbalist theories of the nature of God (II.346–9). Beausobre points out that Spinoza’s system can be understood as a modernization of the work of the Cabbalists, although he recognizes that Buddeus defends Cabbalists against charges of Spinozism (592, II.151; see also II.199). Spinozists are materialist fatalists, to be distinguished from Manicheans (II.431–2).<sup>27</sup>

Without drawing attention to the provenance of the idea, Beausobre accepts Spinoza’s position that the laws of the republic of Israel were particular laws for that people, not applicable to other peoples and not unchangeable (280). But he also does not accept Spinoza’s refutation of miracles: he writes as if there is no question that they once occurred.<sup>28</sup>

Pierre Bayle is a similar case. Jonathan Israel classes him with the Radical Enlightenment, and Gianluca Mori has recently argued that the philosophical implications of his work are radically atheistic and democratic.<sup>29</sup> Other writers like Gerald Cerny have called Bayle “moderate”, presumably because he did not share Jurieu’s call for war against France.<sup>30</sup> Beausobre anticipates both of these schools of

<sup>27</sup> Beausobre discusses the famous Orobio de Castro vs. Limborch debate at pp. 370, 438–64. According to Beausobre, Orobio is a Jew “blinded by his incredulity” (439).

<sup>28</sup> See Schwarzbach: *Politics and Ethics in the Huguenot Diaspora*, p. 117.

<sup>29</sup> Gianluca Mori: *Bayle Philosophe*. Paris: Champion 1999.

<sup>30</sup> G. Cerny: *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization*. The Hague: Nijhoff 1987.

interpretation, finding both radical and moderate opinions to agree or disagree with in Bayle.

Beausobre was well aware that Bayle's work was not always helpful for rehabilitating Protestantism because his exploration of theological paradoxes and difficulties was constantly being accused of atheism. Although he uses Bayle as a source, he makes it clear that he is not following Bayle on the Manicheans. Rather than being properly critical, he charges, Bayle enjoyed "finding, among Christians, the most nonsensical fanaticism, and the most foolish and impudent obscenities", and "amused himself by putting forward and ornately developing the arguments of the Manicheans" (3; cf. II.92–3).

This is not to say that Beausobre did not respect Bayle, and indeed he borrowed from the vocabulary that Bayle had made current in the title of his *Historical and Critical Dictionary*. Beausobre's essay will be a *critical* essay, he writes, in contrast to a mere compilation. It is significant that Beausobre knows only one modern author who has written about heresies in a properly critical manner: Gottfried Arnold. He cites him at several places, although he is not satisfied with his treatment of the Manicheans (239).<sup>31</sup> Arnold was a Pietist who rehabilitated many heretics without, however, undermining religion; presumably this is what Beausobre liked about his work.

Beausobre enjoys correcting Bayle. Bayle was wrong to think that a doctrine about substances without extension was new with Descartes; Beausobre thinks God is pure intelligence, but is inclined to "treat the contrary opinion with a great deal of indulgence" (482–485). Bayle was wrong on details such as missing an important author (II.292) and interpreting Plato his own idiosyncratic way (II.294–5). Bayle is wrong in a big way on his parallels between the Socinians and Spinozists (II.221–3). But Beausobre also followed Bayle in many things, such as agreeing with Bayle's judgment about a *mensonge officieux* of Hierocles (II.177), a mistake of Hyde (II.255), and treating Sebastien Franck as a fanatic.<sup>32</sup>

Beausobre also largely followed Bayle in turning to what has been called fideism as a solution to the conundrums of religion and philosophy. The best solution is to conclude that God's "nature is incom-

<sup>31</sup> He also admits that "I do not understand German" (239).

<sup>32</sup> See J. C. Laursen: Bayle's Anti-millenarianism, in: *Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics*, eds. J. C. Laursen, R. Popkin. Dordrecht: Kluwer 2001, p. 99.

prehensible to the human spirit" (486). The best answer to "proud heretics" is a quote from Paul: "the folly of God is wiser than the wisdom of men" (288). Many times he writes to the effect that "it is a mystery that faith adores but that reason does not comprehend" (380). He leaves the question of the origin of evil to God (II.146). These are all Baylean strategies.

### 8. *Liberalism as the Product of Religion, Moderation, and Conservatism*

The combination of religion, moderation, and conservative views we have identified above in Beausobre's book produced a sense of toleration, open-mindedness, and fairness that feeds into what can be called a proto-liberalism. This attitude surfaces in liberal principles here and there throughout the text. For example, in describing Basilide (the first to introduce Manicheanism into Christianity), Beausobre writes that "one thought with more liberty than nowadays about an infinity of things"; after settling the fundamentals of Christianity, "it was permitted for a learned man to philosophize about the rest" (40; cf. II.261). Those who do not believe in allowing any "liberty to think or to judge" will twist meanings rather than challenge the evidence of the ancients, he observes (64). Beausobre's attacks on the ancient church include the man of letters' regret at the loss of Manichean books: "antiquity made a religion of burning [Mani's] books" (218).

Some of what Beausobre says can sound like John Stuart Mill's liberalism: "What could be of more advantage to the faith", Beausobre asks, than "exposing writings full of fables, the ridiculous, and the obscene to the scorn of the whole world?" (219). Christians burned others' books, but then when the Romans burned theirs, they complained. "One should refute books that contain lies and errors" (219). Revealing that he does not take an extreme libertarian position, he recognizes that books "that corrupt morals and sap the foundations of religion . . . are worthy of burning", but he insists that those of Mani should be refuted (219).

The liberal principle of tolerance was promoted at many places in Beausobre's work.<sup>33</sup> The overall thrust of the work, that the fundamental

---

<sup>33</sup> See Schwarzbach: *Politics and Ethics in the Huguenot Diaspora*, pp. 119–122.

unity of all religions can be traced to common origins, promotes tolerance.<sup>34</sup> Beausobre also borrows much of the ideology of the solidarity of the republic of letters from Bayle.<sup>35</sup> We note the values of the man of letters in such observations of a painting as that, “as bizarre as it was, it was ingenious” (190). Even though he brings out his errors, Beausobre respects Gottfried Arnold’s courage to publish when it cost him his fortune and repose (240). “Involuntary errors of the mind are more worthy of compassion than of severity”, he observed (II.239–40). Beausobre perceived “a very condemnable spirit of domination and intolerance” in the “heads of the church” (II.709), and wrote that he “did not know a better good than the liberty to think, nor a sweeter occupation than the search for the truth, nor a greater pleasure than to find it and say it” (II.730).

Beausobre writes with sympathy of Manichean antipathy to war. Opponents had suggested that the Manicheans ought to praise war for it kills people and hastens the return of their souls to the light. But Beausobre points out that Mani opposed war because “license, violence, and injustices are inseparable from war” (II.797).

Beausobre is an egalitarian: men are “naturally equal” (II. 679–80). But he is not a radical egalitarian. Although he does not trust courtiers (II.744), he writes that civil honors to political leaders are necessary to civil society. The “due subordination” that they create among the naturally equal is necessary for order (II.679–80). Finally, Beausobre also insists upon the rule of law. There is a natural right to be heard in defense that is violated by those who listen only to the charges against the heretics (II.753).

### 9. *The Moderate, Conservative, and Still Religious Tradition after Beausobre*

Beausobre’s tolerant, temporizing approach was followed by many Berlin Huguenots in the following decades. J. H. S. Formey, who edited the second volume of Beausobre’s book on Manicheanism, went on to become the Permanent Secretary of the Prussian Academy

---

<sup>34</sup> See Ralph Häfner: Die Fässer des Zeus: Ein homerisches Mythologem und seine Aufnahme in die Manichäismusedebatte in Deutschland am Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts, in: *Scientia Poetica* vol. 1 (1997), pp. 60–61.

<sup>35</sup> See J. C. Laursen: *Piere Bayle and the Elitism of the Republic of Letters*, in: *Razón pública/Public Reason*, eds. E. Banus, A. Llano. Pamplona: Eunsa 2001).

in 1746, holding that position for half a century until his death in 1797. On the one hand, he railed against the “excess of Pyrrhonism” that was flooding Europe, wrote against Diderot, and rallied to the defense of moderate Christianity. On the other hand, he encouraged Jean Bernard Mérian to translate Hume’s *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* into French partly because he grudgingly recognized that it was important philosophy, even if he added notes designed to refute the most dangerous parts. A prolific scholar, his position has been well-characterized as a middle way.<sup>36</sup>

Swiss scholar Jean Bernard Mérian was also at the Prussian Academy in the years from 1750 to 1807. In many essays for the *Mémoires* of the academy, Mérian fought skepticism and irreligion with ordinary-language philosophy and temporizing concessions. Mérian’s colleague at the academy, J. G. Sulzer, translated Hume’s *Enquiry* into German and his biographer praised the warmth of Sulzer’s conviction of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul.<sup>37</sup>

Toward the latter part of the century, the Castillons and the Ancillons, fathers and sons, continued the tradition. Jean de Castillon was ordered by the philosophically radical Frederick II to translate Cicero’s skeptical *Academica*, which he did, but with enough notes and commentary to Christianize Cicero and completely pull his radical sting.<sup>38</sup> His son, Friedrich Castillon, gained notoriety as the winner of the academy’s prize for answering in the affirmative the question about whether it is useful for political leaders to trick the people.<sup>39</sup> Louis Frédéric Ancillon published an amusing dialogue between Berkeley and Hume in the *Mémoires* in 1799. He did his best to reconcile the two, and to render them harmless to Christianity and social peace.<sup>40</sup> His son, J. P. Friedrich Ancillon was a member of the Academy, wrote for the *Mémoires*, and eventually served as

---

<sup>36</sup> J. C. Laursen: Swiss Anti-skeptics in Berlin, in: Schweizer im Berlin des 18. Jahrhunderts, eds. M. Fontius, H. Holzhey. Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1996, p. 265.

<sup>37</sup> See J. C. Laursen, R. Popkin: Hume in the Prussian Academy, in: Hume Studies 23 (1997), 153–191.

<sup>38</sup> See J. C. Laursen: Cicero in the Prussian Academy, in: History of European Ideas 23 (1997), pp. 117–126 and J. C. Laursen, R. Popkin: Sources of Knowledge of Sextus Empiricus in Kant’s Time, in: British Journal for the History of Philosophy 6 (1998), pp. 261–267.

<sup>39</sup> See W. Kraus: Est-il utile de tromper le peuple? Ist der Volksbetrug von Nutzen? Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1966.

<sup>40</sup> See S. Charles, J. C. Laursen, R. Popkin, A. Zakatistovs: Hume and Berkeley in the Prussian Academy, in: Hume Studies 27 (2001).

Prussian Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1832 to 1837. His was very much a conservative politics, devoted to slowing down the changes in Europe inspired by the French Revolution.

Mention of half a dozen temporizing and still-Christian writers in Berlin in the latter part of the eighteenth century only skims the surface of a much larger and more widespread phenomenon. Albrecht von Haller is an example of a famous natural scientist of the day who also wrote Christian apologetics.<sup>41</sup> Moses Mendelssohn is a good example of an otherwise-enlightened philosopher who wrote to defend a religion widely considered even more backward than Christianity.<sup>42</sup> Beausobre's enterprise, rehabilitating Mani and Manicheanism up to a point, should be considered one of the founding works in the eighteenth century tradition of the moderate, conservative, and still-religious Enlightenment.

---

<sup>41</sup> See J. C. Laursen: *Political Virtue and Anti-skepticism in Albrecht von Haller's Political Novels*, in: *Republikanische Tugend*, eds. M. Böhler, E. Hofmann, P. Reill, S. Zurbuchen. Geneva: Slatkine 2000, pp. 263–281.

<sup>42</sup> Sorkin: *Moses Mendelssohn and the Religious Enlightenment*.

III

HISTORY AND NATURAL LAW

This page intentionally left blank



EIN VERGESSENER PUFENDORF-ÜBERSETZER:  
DER *RÉFUGIÉ* ANTOINE TEISSIER\*

Fiammetta Palladini

Der Hugenotte Antoine Teissier (1632–1715) ist der Literatur über das Berliner *Refuge* nicht ganz unbekannt. Sieglinde Othmer zum Beispiel hat ihm einige wichtige Seiten in ihrem Buch über Berlin und das Naturrecht gewidmet.<sup>1</sup> Auch das neueste, sehr beachtliche *Lexikon der Brandenburgischen Gelehrten der Frühen Neuzeit*<sup>2</sup> enthält einen Artikel von Jürgen Splett über Teissier. Dennoch ist es lohnend, sich noch einmal mit ihm zu beschäftigen—nicht nur um einigen Mängeln der eben erwähnten Werken abzuhelfen, sondern auch um seine Tätigkeit als Pufendorf-Übersetzer etwas näher zu betrachten.

Teissier hat zwei Leben gelebt: das erste vor und das zweite nach der Revokation des Ediktes von Nantes.<sup>3</sup> Vor der Revokation war er das gelehrte Mitglied der Akademie von Nîmes, der Jurist und Anwalt, der auf Grund von Magenproblemen seinen Beruf aber nicht ausüben konnte, sondern sich ganz seinen Studien widmete. Nach der Revokation hören wir nichts mehr von Magenproblemen: er hatte sich 1683 vermählt und ein neues Leben als Hausvater begonnen, mußte sich nun um eine neue Heimat für sich und seine Familie kümmern. Er wandert in die Schweiz aus, wo er fast sieben Jahre, von Oktober 1685 bis zum August 1692, lebte—meistens in Zürich,

---

\* Ich bin den Freundinnen Ute Brandis und Helga Döhn für die Überprüfung des deutschen Textes sehr dankbar.

<sup>1</sup> Sieglinde C. Othmer: Berlin und die Verbreitung des Naturrechts in Europa. Kultur- und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zu Jean Barbeyracs Pufendorf-Übersetzungen und eine Analyse seiner Leserschaft. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1970 (Veröffentlichungen der historischen Kommission zu Berlin 30), S. 45–54.

<sup>2</sup> Bio-Bibliographien. Brandenburgische Gelehrte der frühen Neuzeit Berlin-Cölln 1688–1713. Berlin: Akademie Verlag 2000 (Darin auf S. 468–473 der Artikel 'Teissier' von Jürgen Splett).

<sup>3</sup> Alle biographischen Angaben habe ich aus dem anonymen "Eloge de M. Teissier" in: *Nouvelles Littéraires contenant ce qui se passe de plus considerable dans la République des Lettres*. La Haye: Chez Henry du Sauzet, Bd. IV, 1715, S. 129–144 entnommen. Auch Jean Pierre Nicéron (*Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres dans la République des Lettres*, Bd. 5 S. 256ff.) hat seine Biographie von Teissier aus den *Nouvelles*.

zwischen August 1689 und April 1691 auch in Bern, wo er die französische *Gazette de Berne* herausgab.<sup>4</sup> In Zürich hatte er einige adelige Jungen privat unterrichtet, sie mit *De iure belli ac pacis* von Hugo Grotius bekannt gemacht, und Pufendorfs Werk *De habitu religionis christianae ad vitam civilem* (1687), ins Französische übersetzt, worum Zürcher Professoren ihn gebeten hatten.<sup>5</sup>

So viel wir wissen, war das der erste (indirekte) Kontakt zwischen Teissier und Pufendorf. Die zweite Anspielung auf Pufendorf finden wir in einem für den Brandenburgischen Kurfürsten bestimmten *Curriculum*, das Teissier, der im September 1692 mit einem Empfehlungsschreiben des Bürgermeisters und des Rats der Stadt Zürich<sup>6</sup> in Berlin angekommen war, am 1. November 1692 schreibt.<sup>7</sup> Darin sagt er, daß er mit seiner Familie nach Berlin gekommen sei, um hier den Rest seines Lebens zu verbringen und daß er die Absicht habe, sich mit der Komposition einer Geschichte des Großen Kurfürsten zu befassen, was er in der an Friedrich Wilhelm gerichteten Widmung zu einer seiner Schriften bereits angekündigt hatte. Er habe aber erfahren, daß Pufendorf eine solche Geschichte des Großen Kurfürsten bereits geschrieben hätte, in lateinischer Sprache, so daß ihm nur noch übrig bliebe, Pufendorfs Werk in eine der schönsten Sprachen der Welt, die französische, zu übersetzen.<sup>8</sup>

Hier möchte ich eine Parenthese über das eben erwähnte, dem Großen Kurfürsten gewidmete Werk von Teissier einfügen. Wie Othmer schon wußte, handelt es sich um die *Exhortation adressée aux Protestans contenant les raisons qui doivent les obliger à se réunir ensemble* (Amsterdam: Charles Duchesne, 1687). Was Othmer aber unbekannt blieb, ist die Tatsache, daß dieses Werk eine Übersetzung des zweiten Teils von dem Buche des Zürcher Theologen, Freundes und Förderer Teissiers, Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633–1698), ist: *In viam Concordiae Protestantium Ecclesiasticae Manuductio* (Amsterdam: H. Wetstein,

<sup>4</sup> Über diese Gazette ausführlicher in Bio-Bibliographien (wie Anm. 2), S. 469.

<sup>5</sup> S. Pufendorf, *Traité de la Religion Chretienne par rapport à la vie Civile ou l'on fait voir que l'Eglise n'est point un Etat, et que la puissance des Princes ne va pas jusqu' à dominer sur la foy . . . mis en François par Mr de Saint Amant* [i.e. A. Teissier]. Utrecht: Antoine Schouten 1690.

<sup>6</sup> Berlin, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStAPK), I HA, Rep. 122, 3a, Nr. 5, Bl. 23r/v. Vgl. Anhang I.

<sup>7</sup> Ebd., Bl. 24 r/v. Vgl. Anhang II.

<sup>8</sup> Ebd. Vgl. Anhang II.

1687).<sup>9</sup> Die Übersetzung des ersten Teils von Heideggers Buch durch Teissier war zur gleichem Zeit und bei dem gleichen Verleger unter dem Titel *Traité de la concorde ecclésiastique des Protestans* erschienen und dem Herzog Friedrich Karl von Württemberg gewidmet. Die Annahme, daß Teissier der Autor und nicht bloß der Übersetzer dieses Werkes wäre, was vor orthodoxen Augen als gewagt gelten konnte, verleitet Othmer zu einer Einschätzung der intellektuellen Persönlichkeit dieses Autors, die ihm zuviel Kühnheit zuschreibt. Aus gleichem Grunde nimmt sie an, daß Teissier der Verfasser eines Artikels über eine Ausgabe von Grotius' *De iure belli ac pacis* in Etienne Chauvins *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans, dressé a Berlin* gewesen sei. Das ist eine Schlußfolgerung, die meiner Ansicht nach mit der genannten Voraussetzung zusammenfällt.<sup>10</sup>

Aber kommen wir zu Teissiers Wunsch zurück, Pufendorfs Werk übersetzen zu wollen. Sein Wunsch wurde erfüllt: Kurfürst Friedrich III. von Brandenburg ernannte ihn zum Rat und Historiographen mit einem Gehalt von 300 Talern pro Jahr.<sup>11</sup> Wie wir von Charles Ancillons *Geschichte der Refugiés im Brandenburg* wissen, war ein solches Gehalt mit dem Titel eines Legationsrats verbunden—ein Titel, der den wichtigsten oder den adligen Juristen vorbehalten war und einen hohen Rang in der Gesellschaft gewährleistete.<sup>12</sup> Teissier hat sich vermutlich sofort an die Arbeit gemacht. Am 19. März 1694 befahl der Kurfürst dem Archivar Johann Magirus, "diejenige in dem Archivo vorhandene frantzösische Tractaten, Urkunden und Briefschriefften, welche dero geheimder Raht, der Herr Puffendorff, in seiner Brandenburgischen Historie angeführet, und hhm.[?] designiren wird, dero Raht Teissier in originali in dem Archivo zu communiciren, damit sich derselben beij transferirung sothaner Historie in die frantzösische

<sup>9</sup> Auch Splett (wie Anm. 2) S. 471, wußte noch nicht, daß es sich um ein Werk von Heidegger handelt.

<sup>10</sup> Othmer (wie Anm. 1) S. 49–53. *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans dressé a Berlin* Par Mr. C.[hauvin]. Berlin: Chez Robert Roger, Première Année 1696, Mois de Mai et Juin, S. 219–37, Art. III: Hugonis Grotii de Jure belli ac pacis . . . tum noviter accuratis commentariis perpetuis Joh. Tesmari, Francofurti ad Moenum 1696.

<sup>11</sup> Bestallungsurkunde vom 17. November 1692: GStAPK, Rep. 122, 3a, Nr. 5, Bl. 26–27.

<sup>12</sup> Charles Ancillon: *Historie de l'Etablissement des François Réfugiez dans les Etats de Son Altesse Electorale de Brandebourg*. Berlin: Robert Roger 1690, S. 88–90. Ich habe keine archivalische Bestätigung der Behauptung Othmers (S. 47) gefunden, daß Teissier erst 1701 zum Legationsrat ernannt wurde.

Sprache bedienen möge.”<sup>13</sup> Am 19. Dezember 1695 war die Übersetzung schon vollendet, wie wir aus einem Notizzettel erfahren, der einem kurfürstlichen Brief dieses Datums an Teissier (auf den wir noch zurückkommen werden) beigelegt ist. In dieser Notiz heißt es: “Die frantzösische übersetzung soll zwar bereits fertig sijn, es hat sich aber des Buchführers Schreijens Bericht nach noch kein Verleger darzu angegeben”.<sup>14</sup> Diese Nachricht über eine Vollendung der Übersetzung wird von Etienne Chauvin bestätigt, der Anfang 1696 in seinem *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans* seine Rezension von Pufendorfs Geschichte des Großen Kurfürsten mit der Bemerkung schließt, daß er die fertige französische Übersetzung von Teissier gesehen habe, die bald erscheinen werde und so schön sei wie das Original.<sup>15</sup>

Dennoch ist die Übersetzung nie veröffentlicht worden. Die Geschichte des Scheiterns wurde 1876 von Gustav Droysen sehr knapp geschildert.<sup>16</sup> Eine ausführlichere Untersuchung über die französische Übersetzung von Pufendorfs Geschichte hatte in den Jahren 1903 und 1904 der Oberlehrer Dr. Richard Schulze in zwei Programmen des Gymnasiums zu Ohrdruf/Thüringen herausgebracht.<sup>17</sup> Der Literatur blieb diese wichtige Abhandlung unbekannt, und das ist zu bedauern, denn sie stützt sich auf die Akten des Geheimen Staatsarchivs in Berlin—allerdings nennt Schulze leider keine Signaturen. Das bedeutet, daß man diese Akten heute erst wieder auffinden muß, und das haben wir nach der Anleitung von Schulze unternommen und wollen hier darüber berichten.

Schulze schreibt: “Weshalb Teissiers Übersetzung nicht gedruckt wurde, ist aus den Akten nicht ersichtlich. Nirgends findet sich ein Verbot, die Übersetzung zum Druck zu geben”.<sup>18</sup> Das ist richtig, wenn wir ein formelles Verbot suchen. Aber wir finden in den Akten noch etwas anderes, z.B. einen an den Kurfürsten gerichteten Brief

<sup>13</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 9 K Lit. F. Fasc. 7, Bl. 46.

<sup>14</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 9 K Lit. F. Fasc. 7, Bl. 26.

<sup>15</sup> *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans* (wie Anm. 10), 1696, Mars et April, Art. I, S. 124.

<sup>16</sup> Gustav Droysen: Zur Kritik Pufendorfs in: *Abhandlungen Zur neueren Geschichte*. Leipzig 1876, S. 309–86 (besonders S. 320–21).

<sup>17</sup> Richard Schulze: Pufendorfs “Res Brandenburgicae” und deren Übertragung ins Französische, in: *Jahresbericht des Gräflich Gleichenschen Gymnasiums Realschule und Progymnasium zu Ohrdruf für das Schuljahr 1902/1903*. Ohrdruf 1903 (Programm Nr. 806), S. 1–10. Fortsetzung und Schluß im Programm für das Schuljahr 1903/1904. Ohrdruf 1904 (Programm Nr. 821), S. 1–10.

<sup>18</sup> Ebd., 1904 (Progr. Nr. 821), S. 8.

des Feldmarschalls Johann Adam von Schöning (1641–1696), der sich über die Darstellung seiner Person in Pufendorfs Geschichte beschwerte. Schöning verlangte eine Zensur der ihn betreffenden Stellen in den geplanten französischen und deutschen Übersetzungen.<sup>19</sup> In dem bereits erwähnten Brief vom 19. Dezember 1695 befahl der Kurfürst, daß Teissier die Schöning betreffenden Stellen in seiner Übersetzung also weglassen möge.<sup>20</sup> Aber Schöning war nicht der einzige, der sich wegen Pufendorfs Geschichte beschwert hatte. In einem anderen Aufsatz haben wir schon die Geschichte der Satirischen Gedichte gegen Pufendorfs Historie und die der Manöver von Leibniz gegen eine Veröffentlichung von Teissiers französischer Übersetzung behandelt.<sup>21</sup> Alles das beweist, daß es um Pufendorfs Werke und deren Übersetzung nicht gut bestellt war—and es mag zutreffen, was Droysen und Schulze bereits vermuteten: daß die entscheidende Wende mit dem Sturz des Minsters Eberhard von Danckelmann (1643–1722) zusammenging. Teissier hatte inzwischen in Holland einen Verleger für seine Übersetzung gefunden, aber weil mit Danckelmanns Sturz auch dessen Anhänger und Schützlinge verdächtig geworden waren (und Pufendorf und seine Geschichte zählten zu den Protegés Danckelmanns!), befahl der Kurfürst am 11. April 1698 dem Geheimen Rat und Archivar Johann Sigismund Sturm,<sup>22</sup> ein Gutachten über Pufendorfs Geschichte abzugeben,<sup>23</sup> bevor Teissier eine Druckerlaubnis zu erteilen sein. Das sehr umfangreiche Gutachten von Sturm ist datiert vom 17. November 1699. Auf siebenundzwanzig Folioseiten beweist er, es sei durch Pufendorfs Methode bedingt, daß seine Geschichte des Großen Kurfürsten für die Interessen Brandenburgs gefährlich sein könnte und man sollte die Übersetzung in eine Universalsprache wie die französische also am besten ganz untersagen.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 9 K, Lit. F. Fasc. 7, Bl. 27–29 (undatiert, aber die Antwort ist vom 19.12.1695).—Die von Schöning zitierte Pufendorf-Stelle befindet sich im Buch XIX, § 26.

<sup>20</sup> Es handelt sich um den oben im Text zitierten Brief an Teissier vom 19.12.1695. GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 9K, Lit. F. Fasc. 7, Bl. 30.

<sup>21</sup> Fiammetta Palladini: Poesie satiriche sulla Storia del Grande Elettore di S. Pufendorf in: Neulateinisches Jahrbuch I (1999), S. 171–88 (besonders S. 178–80).

<sup>22</sup> Er wurde am 31. Dezember 1697 als Archivar vereidigt. Vgl. GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 9, O2, Fasc. 13, Bl. 3.

<sup>23</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 122 N. 34.3, Bl. 46. Daß Teissier einen Verleger gefunden hatte, geht aus den Zeilen 12–14 hervor. Schulze (wie Anm. 17), Ohrdruf 1904 (Programm N. 821), S. 8, spricht irrtümlich vom Jahr 1699.

<sup>24</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 9 K, Lit. F. Fasc. 7, Bl. 56–83.

Mit diesem Urteil ist das Schicksal der mühsamen Arbeit von Teissier entschieden: die fertiggestellte, wunderschöne französische Übersetzung blieb unveröffentlicht im Archiv liegen, wo sie sich noch heute befindet—leider unvollständig, worauf wir aber noch zurückkommen werden. Jetzt wollen wir unsere Untersuchung über die vergeblichen Versuche Teissiers, wenigstens sein *Abrégé* dieser Übersetzung veröffentlichen zu lassen, fortsetzen. Diesbezüglich kannten Droysen und Schulze nur den Befehl, den Kurfürst Friedrich III. am 11. September 1699 den Archivaren Sturm und Johann Jacob Julius Chuno<sup>25</sup> erteilt hatte und wo es heißt, das “vor Unsers Sohns des Churprintzen” verfertigte *Abrégé* zu examinieren,<sup>26</sup> mit dem Ergebnis, welches Chuno selbst auf das Manuskript des *Abrégés* geschrieben hatte: “Es ist befohlen worden, dieses zu reponiren und soll nicht gedruckt werden”.<sup>27</sup> Weder Droysen noch Schulze kannten die Unterlagen, die ich gefunden habe und die uns eine etwas andere Geschichte erzählen als jene, die Schulze sich zusammengereimt hatte. Dieser vermutete, daß Chuno unter Leibniz’ Einfluß (bekanntlich war Chuno mit Leibniz im Briefwechsel) einen negativen Bericht erstattet hatte, der zum Druckverbot führte.<sup>28</sup> Es ist aber das Gegenteil der Fall gewesen—Chuno hatte ein *positives* Urteil abgegeben, wie wir aus einem Brief des Premierministers Johann Kasimir Kolbe von Wartenberg<sup>29</sup> an Chuno erfahren. Dieser Brief vom Oktober 1704 wird in einer Abschrift von Teissiers Hand im Geheimen Staatsarchiv aufbewahrt,<sup>30</sup> und es heißt darin, daß Teissier gestattet sei, das Werk drucken zu lassen, weil Wartenberg erfahren habe, daß Chuno nach der Überprüfung von Teissiers Manuskript und nach einigen Änderun-

<sup>25</sup> Johann Jacob Julius Chuno (1661–1715), ehemaliger Sekretär von Eberhard von Danckelman. Wurde am 18.4.1696 zum Geheimen Kabinettsarchivar ernannt, 1701 Mitglied, später Direktor der mathematischen Klasse der Societät der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1706 Hofrat und erster Archivar des königl. Archivs.

<sup>26</sup> GStAPK, HA I, Rep. 122, 3a, N. 6, Bl. 72.

<sup>27</sup> GStAPK, HA I, Rep. 94 IV Ha 2: Unterhalb des Titels der ersten in diesem Sammelband erhaltenen Schrift (“Abrege de Mr. Teissier, Conseiller et Historiographe du Roy de l’Histoire de Frederic Guillaume le Grand, Electeur de Brandebourg”).

<sup>28</sup> Schulze (wie Anm. 17), Ohrdruf 1904 (Programm N. 821), S. 9.

<sup>29</sup> Johann Kasimir von Kolbe, Reichsgraf von Wartenberg (1643–1712), Oberkämmerer und Oberstallmeister, ab 1702 Premierminister, Vorsitzender der Generalökonomiedirektion. Wurde 1711 gestürzt, nachdem er die Finanzen in Verwirrung gebracht hatte.

<sup>30</sup> GStAPK, HA I, Rep. 11, Nr. 34, Fasc. 4, Bl. 2: Brief von Wartenberg an Chuno, Magdeburg 22. Oktober 1704. Vgl. Anhang III.

gen “l’avez trouvé digne qu’il soit rendu public”. Jedoch bekam das Werk nie eine offizielle Druckerlaubnis, wie wir aus der Tatsache folgern können, daß Teissier drei Jahre später gezwungen war, ein *Mémoire* an den vergeblichen Minister zu schicken, in welchem er ihn daran erinnerte, daß “il y a quelques tems” sein Manuskript von Sturm und Chuno durchgelesen worden sei, die einige Bemerkungen gemacht hätten (wir sind schon im Jahre 1707, und Sturm und Chuno hatten das Werk um 1699/1700 überprüft!). Jetzt bittet er um eine neue Überprüfung “par des personnes très versées dans ces sortes de chose la”, weil “on a porté diverses plaintes contre cette Histoire.”<sup>31</sup> Teissier ist 1707 bereits fünfundsiebzig Jahre alt. Man erkennt sein Alter und seine Müdigkeit an seiner Handschrift, die immer unsicherer wird. Aber trotzdem gibt er nicht auf: er will seine Übersetzung, mindestens in Form des *Abrégé*, veröffentlicht sehen. Graf Wartenberg, etwas gelangweilt, und ohne zu zeigen, daß er sich an die positive Auskunft erinnert, die er vor drei Jahren gegeben hatte, schreibt an Chuno, daß, “comme la dite Histoire a faite du bruit, Mr. d’Ilgen<sup>32</sup> aussibien que moy jugions mieux, que cet abregé, quand il sera achevé par Mr. Teissier soit asservé dans l’Archiv et qu’il ne soit pas imprimé dans les conjonctures presentes”.<sup>33</sup> Armer Teissier! Nach dem Schaden nun auch der Spott: sein *Abrégé* war schon seit acht Jahren fertig! Aber Teissier gibt die Hoffnung nicht auf. Er wartet auf den Machtwechsel, um es nochmals zu versuchen. Im Jahr 1711 war Graf Wartenberg wegen Verschwendung, Unterschlagung und Untreue gestürzt worden und 1713 bestieg der ehemalige Knabe, für den Teissier das *Abrégé* und viele andere Werke verfaßt hatte, den königlichen Thron.<sup>34</sup> Auch wenn Teissier sich keine

<sup>31</sup> Ebd., Bl. 5. Vgl. Anhang III.

<sup>32</sup> Heinrich Rüdiger von Ilgen (1654–1728), rechte Hand von Graf Wartenberg, Leiter der auswärtigen Angelegenheiten auch nach seinem Sturz, war zugleich Leiter der Zivilverwaltung.

<sup>33</sup> GStAPK, HA I, Rep. 11, Nr. 34, Fasc. 4, Bl. 4. Vgl. Anhang III.

<sup>34</sup> Für den Kronprinzen, den späteren König Friedrich Wilhelm I., hatte Teissier außer dem *Abrégé* die folgenden Werke verfaßt bzw. übersetzt:

- 1) Instructions de l’Empereur Charles-Quint à Philippe II, Roi d’Espagne, et de Philippe II au Prince Philippe son fils, Berlin 1699 (auch u.d.T. Instructions morales et politiques, Berlin 1700). Für diese Schrift, die—wie Niceron erzählt—eine Übersetzung aus einer italienischen Handschrift war, bekam er vom Kurfürsten 50 Taler Belohnung (GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 122, 3a, Nr. 6, Bl. 90).
- 2) *Abregé de l’histoire de Quatre Monarchie de Sleidan*, Berlin 1700.
- 3) *Lettres choisies de Calvin*, trad. en François, Berlin 1702.

Illusionen über die Neigung des Königs für die Geisteswissenschaften machte,<sup>35</sup> versuchte er 1714 noch einmal, die Veröffentlichung seines *Abrégés* durchzusetzen. Mit zittriger Hand (ein Jahr vor seinem Tod, er ist zweiundachtzig) schreibt er eine Petition an den König, in welcher er versucht, dessen militärischen Vorlieben zu schmeicheln: die Lektüre seines *Abrégé*, sagt er, “ne peut être que très agréable à Votre Majesté. Sut tout le recit de ses [von Friedrich Wilhelm] exploits guerriers et Héroïques.”<sup>36</sup> Dieses Mal kommt die Antwort von dem kultivierten, den Gelehrten wohlwollenden gegenüberstehenden Minister Marquard Ludwig von Printzen,<sup>37</sup> der am 3. Oktober 1714 dem Hofrat Chuno eine erneute Überprüfung des Werkes anordnete.<sup>38</sup> Was aus dieser neuen Untersuchung geworden ist, wissen wir leider nicht. Wahrscheinlich ist sie nie erfolgt, weil ein Jahr später sowohl Teissier als auch Chuno starben—Teissier am 7. September 1715, ohne seinen Wunsch erfüllt zu sehen.

4) *Abrégé de l'histoire des Electeurs de Brandebourg par demandes et réponses*, Berlin 1705.—Im Anhang: *Suite de l'histoire des Electeurs et Margraves de Brandebourg, contenant les dernières heures de Frederic Guillaume, le Grand Electeur de Brandebourg*, Berlin 1705. Es handelt sich um die Übersetzung der Beschreibung des Todes Friedrich Wilhelms in Pufendorfs *Commentarii*, XIX, § 100. Dieses Werk ist dem Kronprinzen gewidmet.

5) *Les Vies des Electeurs de Brandebourg de la maison des burggraves de Nuremberg, . . . composé en Latin par Jean Cernitius . . . et mis en François par A. Teissier*, Berlin 1707.

6) *La vie d'Ernest le Pieux, duc de Saxe-Gotha*, trad. du Latin de Eyringius, Berlin 1707.

7) *Abrégé de la vie de divers Princes illustres, avec des réflexions historiques sur leur conduite et sur leurs actions*, Amsterdam 1710.—Es handelt sich um die Leben von Scipio Africanus, Alfons von Aragon, Tamerlan, Skanderbeg und Abissinus, dem mythischen König von Äthiopien.

8) *Traité de S. Chrisostome où il montre qu'on ne souffre aucun mal que celui qu'on se fait à soi-même*, trad. du Grec, Berlin 1710.

<sup>35</sup> Das geht aus einem interessanten Brief an Leibniz vom 20. Juli 1706 hervor, in welchem er Leibniz um Hilfe bittet, weil er um seine Pension von 60 Thalern fürchtet, die ihm vom Graf Alexander von Dohna zugewiesen wurde, “pour m'engager à faire divers ouvrages pour l'usage de son Altesse Royale. [. . .] Mais comme Monseigneur le Prince Royal a tourné toutes ses inclinations du côté de la guerre, et qu'il paroît ne faire pas grand cas des livres, ni de ceux qui en composent, j'appréhende qu'il ne trouve que le peu qu'il me donne est mal employé.” Hannover, Nieders. Landesbibl., Leibniz-Briefe 913, Bl. 3–4. Vgl. Anhang IV.

<sup>36</sup> GStAPK, HA I, Rep. 11 Nr. 34, Fasc. 4, Bl. 9. Vgl. Anhang III.

<sup>37</sup> Marquard Ludwig Printzen (1675–1725), wirklicher Geheimer Staats- und Kabinettsrat, Minister, Präsident des Oberkonsistoriums, Leiter der Zivilverwaltung. Machte sich verdient um den Bau der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften.

<sup>38</sup> GStAPK, HA I, Rep. 11 Nr. 34, Fasc. 4, Bl. 8. Vgl. Anhang III.



Die Beharrung Teissiers, seine Pufendorf-Übersetzung veröffentlicht zu sehen, erklärt sich nicht nur mit dem menschlichen Wunsch, daß die eigene Mühe nicht umsonst gewesen sein möge, sondern wahrscheinlich auch aus der Gewißheit, daß jene Übersetzung die beste aller seiner vielen Übersetzungen war: ein echtes Meisterwerk. Unter seinen Übersetzungen anderer Werke von Pufendorf ist die der Geschichte des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm ohne Zweifel die gelungenste. Wie wir gesehen habe, hatte Teissier, als er sich noch in Zürich aufhielt, bereits Pufendorfs Werk über die Beziehungen zwischen Staat und Kirche übersetzt.<sup>39</sup> In Berlin hatte er, zeitgleich mit seiner Übersetzung der Geschichte Friedrich Wilhelms—auch das *De officio hominis et civis* in die französische Sprache übertragen und 1696 herausgebracht.<sup>40</sup> Nur Othmer hat dieser Übersetzung einige Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt—eine Übersetzung, von der man annehmen könnte, sie wäre von niemandem wahrgenommen worden, auch nicht vom späteren zweiten französischen Übersetzer desselben Werkes, der in der gleichen Stadt und im gleichen Umfeld wie Teissier wirkte: dem berühmten Jean Barbeyrac (1674–1744). Im Vorwort seiner Übersetzung von *De officio*<sup>41</sup> gibt Barbeyrac absolut keinen Hinweis auf die vorausgegangene Übersetzung von Teissier, und wie ein Vergleich zwischen den beiden Werken zeigt, hat er sie weder nachgeahmt noch benutzt. Man könnte fast zu der Schlußfolgerung kommen, daß Barbeyrac die Existenz von Teissiers Übersetzung ignorierte, wenn nicht eine Anspielung in einer Fußnote wäre, in welcher er sagt, daß man “nicht vergessen dürfe”, Pufendorfs Vorwort zu *De officio* auch zu übersetzen, weil man darin wichtige Ideen finde, die nicht im Hauptwerk erhalten seien.<sup>42</sup> Diese Anspielung wird nur von denen verstanden werden können, die wissen, daß Teissier das Vorwort zu *De officio* gar nicht übersetzt hatte! Natürlich nicht, weil er

<sup>39</sup> Vgl. Anm. 5.

<sup>40</sup> Les Devoirs des hommes et des citoyens, suivant la loi naturelle. Ouvrage composé en Latin par Mr. le Baron de Puffendorf. Et mis en François Par Antoine Teissier, conseiller et Historiographe de Sa Sérénité electorale de Brandenbourg. Berlin: Chez Robert Roger 1696.

<sup>41</sup> Les Devoirs de l'Homme et du citoien, tels qu'ils lui sont prescrits par la Loi naturelle. Traduit du Latin de feu Mr. le Baron de Pufendorf, par Jean Barbeyrac. Avec quelques Notes du Traducteur. Amsterdam: Chez Henri Schelte 1707.

<sup>42</sup> Ebd., S. XVI–XVII, Anm. C: “La plus part [des réparations] ons lieu aussi à l'égard de la Préface de l'auteur, qu'il ne falloit pas oublier de traduire, puis qu'elle contient des réflexions importantes qu'on ne trouvera pas même dans le gros Ouvrage.”

es "vergessen" hätte, wie Barbeyrac ziemlich ironisch sagt, sonder weil Teissier ein vorsichtiger Mensch war, der das heikle Thema der Unabhängigkeit der Philosophie von der Theologie nicht berühren wollte.

Die beiden Pufendorf-Übersetzungen von Teissier, die von *De habitu religionis* und die von *De officio*, sind zwar korrekt und nicht schlecht, aber sie haben keinen Schwung, die Lebhaftigkeit und Überzeugungskraft der Originale bleiben unerreicht. Beide Übersetzungen zeigen sehr deutlich, daß die Philosophie nicht Teissiers Stärke war—wenn es um Feinheiten geht, wird er oberflächlich und unpräzise. Beim *De officio* zum Beispiel hat er Pufendorfs Text wortgetreuer übersetzt als Barbeyrac, aber dessen interpretierende Übersetzung ist im wesentlichen besser und präziser. Die wahre Stärke von Teissier war in der Tat die Geschichte. Die Lektüre der Brandenburgischen Historie von Pufendorf in Teissiers Übersetzung ist ein echtes Vergnügen! Man liest und liest und möchte nicht mehr aufhören. Die Erzählung fließt elegant und überzeugend, sie langweilt nie, auch dann nicht, wenn sie sehr technisch und minutiös wird. Man kommt fast in Versuchung zu sagen, daß die Übersetzung schöner ist als das Original. Wäre sie veröffentlicht worden, so hätte Pufendorfs Geschichte ein Bestseller werden können.

Die Unterdrückung einer Veröffentlichung von Teissiers Übersetzung hat sie aber nicht ganz aus der Welt geschafft. Auch wenn sie leider unvollständig überliefert wurde, können wir sie noch lesen. Wie Schulze schon entdeckt hatte, befindet sich das Manuskript der Übersetzung im Geheimen Staatsarchiv zu Berlin. Er sagte damals, daß sie irrtümlich unter dem Namen des italienischen Historikers Gregorio Leti<sup>43</sup> verzeichnet wäre. Da er aber, wie bereits erwähnt, keine Signaturen angibt, mußte ich die Suche von vorn beginnen. Ich habe die Bände, die Schulze beschreibt, in dem Repositorium der kleinen Erwerbungen gefunden.<sup>44</sup> Das Register schreibt sie ganz

<sup>43</sup> Gregorio Leti (1630–1701), italienischer Polygraph, bekannt für seine satirischen historischen Werke gegen den Papst, wird gewöhnlich als ein Abenteurer der Geschichtsschreibung betrachtet. Er hat "Ritratti istorici della casa Elettorale di Brandenburgo". Amsterdam: 1687, geschrieben, in welchen eine Geschichte des Großen Kurfürsten enthalten ist. Vgl. Ernst Fischer: Die officiële brandenbugische Geschichtsschreibung, in: Zeitschrift f. Preuß. Geschichte u. Landeskunde, XV (1878), S. 377–430, besonders S. 419f.

<sup>44</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 94, IV. Ha 1 (= Konzept, überwiegend Autograph von Teissier, in 21 Bänden oder Faszikeln); und Rep. 94, IV. Ha 1<sup>1/2</sup> (= Reinschrift, 9 Bände oder Faszikel mit Kopien von einem Teil der Konzepte).

korrekt Teissier zu und nennt den Namen Leti nicht. Aber daß Schulze genau diese Archivalien gemeint hat, geht es aus einem Papierstreifen hervor, der sich in einem der hier zu beschreibenden Bände<sup>45</sup> befindet. Auf diesem Papierstreifen ist notiert: "Leti, Histoire de Frédéric Guillaume le Grand Électeur". Wie auch immer diese mysteriöse Zuschreibung an Leti zustande gekommen sein mag,—wenden wir uns nun bald den Bänden zu, in denen sich die Übersetzung von Teissier befindet. Wir beginnen mit dem Sammelband, in welchem der genannte Papierstreifen enthalten ist. Es handelt sich um jenen Band, der das erste Mal von Droysen beschrieben wurde.<sup>46</sup> Dessen Beschreibung wurde dann von Schulze berichtigt, und wir möchten unsererseits Schulzes Angaben ergänzen. Wie Schulze sagt, ist das erste Stück des Sammelbandes das *Abrégé* (und zwar das sogenannte große *Abrégé*) der Übersetzung Teissiers von Pufendorfs Geschichte. Es umfaßt zehn Bücher mit insgesamt 759 Folioseiten. Es fehlen die ersten 44 Seiten, d.h. das erste Buch und der Anfang des zweiten Buches bis zu § 48. Was Schulze nicht wußte—weil, wie er selbst berichtet,<sup>47</sup> er keine Gelegenheit hatte, die Handschriften der ehemaligen Königlichen Bibliothek in Berlin einzusehen—ist die Tatsache, daß eine vollständige Fassung der großen *Abrégé* sich in drei schönen Lederbänden mit dem Wappen der Königin Sophie Dorothea von Preußen, Gemahlin von Friedrich Wilhelm I., befindet, die in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin aufbewahrt werden.<sup>48</sup> Darüber hinaus besitzt diese Bibliothek noch einen Teil der vollständigen Übersetzung, und zwar die Reinschrift vom vierten Buch, die später erworben und neben den drei Bänden des *Abrégé* aufgestellt wurde.<sup>49</sup> Eine vollständige Übersetzung von Pufendorfs Werk befindet sich dagegen nicht in der Staatsbibliothek, und wie ich aus den alten

<sup>45</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 94, IV. Ha 2.

<sup>46</sup> Droysen: Zur Kritik Pufendorfs (wie Anm. 16), S. 321.

<sup>47</sup> Schulze (wie Anm. 17), Ohrdruf 1904 (Programm N. 821), S. 8, Anm. 2.

<sup>48</sup> Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-preußischer Kulturbesitz: Mss. Boruss. fol. 168–170. Ich bin Herrn Dr. Andreas Wittenberg für seine Hilfe bei der Identifizierung des Monogramms auf den Einbänden sehr dankbar.

<sup>49</sup> Ms. Boruss. fol. 170a.—Daß dieser Band erst später erworben wurde, geht aus älteren Katalogen hervor: In Ms. Cat. A 473 sind nur Mss. Boruss. fol. 168–170 verzeichnet. In Ms. Cat. A 533 wurde auch Ms. Boruss. fol. 170a mit einer späteren Ergänzung eingetragen. Es handelt sich mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit um einen der im GStAPK fehlenden Bände der Reinschrift, die wir im Text noch besprechen werden. Die Handschrift der Manuskripte im Staatsarchiv und in Ms. Boruss. Fol. 170a ist identisch oder jedenfalls die gleiche.

Katalogen erschen konnte, hat sie sich auch niemals dort befunden. Die Behauptung von Oelrichs, daß Teissiers vollständige Übersetzung in vier Foliobänden in der Königlichen Bibliothek vorhanden sei,<sup>50</sup> was von anderen Biographen Teissiers dann aufgenommen wurde, hat sich also als falsch erwiesen.

Aber fahren wir fort mit der Beschreibung des Sammelbandes im Geheimen Staatsarchiv. Wie Schulze erzählt, folgt in diesem Band dem großen *Abrégé* ein *Abrégé des Abrégés*, das von Teissiers Hand geschrieben ist. Es handelt sich um 65 Oktavseiten. Das dritte und letzte Stück des Sammelbandes sind 16 Seiten in noch kleinerem Format, die eine Zusammenfassung der Geschichte des Kurfürsten Friedrich Wilhelm von 1640 bis 1660 enthalten. Weder Droysen noch Schulze hatten erkannt, daß der vermeintliche Titel dieses letzten Stückes—“Journal de Berlin 1696”—kein Titel ist, sondern die Bemerkung eines Archivars, der auf das ‘Journal de Berlin’ von 1696, d.h. auf das oben bereits genannte *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans* von Chauvin, verweist. In der Tat sind die 16 Seiten nichts anderes als der Anfang der schon erwähnten Rezension von Pufendorfs Geschichte durch Chauvin.<sup>51</sup> Grund genug, um die Autorschaft Teissiers an diesem Stück zu bezweifeln: die Rezension ist ohne Frage von Chauvin, denn hätte er die Übersetzung von Teissier benutzt, so hätte er seine Verbindlichkeit diesem gegenüber ausgedrückt, als er—wie wir bereits sahen—seine Übersetzung lobend erwähnte.<sup>52</sup>

Kommen wir nun zu der Übersetzung des ganzen Werkes, die (leider unvollständig) im Geheimen Staatsarchiv aufbewahrt wird.<sup>53</sup> Das Konzept ist größtenteils ein Autograph von Teissier selbst. Es handelt sich um 21 Einheiten, bestehend aus 8 Bänden und 13 ungebundenen Heftbündeln. In diesem Konzept fehlen die folgenden Teile des Werkes: von Buch II,31 bis zu Buch III,27; von V,26 bis zu V,52; von VIII,78 bis zu IX,21; von XIII,1 bis zu XIII,30; von

<sup>50</sup> Johann Karl Konrad Oelrichs: *Commentationes Historico Literariae Quarum . . . Posterior Historiographos Brandenburgicos recenset*. Berolini: 1751. Dort auf S. 53: “Is [Teissier] iussu Electoris, Pufendorffii vitam Friderici Wilhelmi M. in linguam gallicam transtulit, laboreque absoluto, summam quandringentorum Thalerum dono ab Electore accepit. Traslatio haec, quatuor Tomis, in forma maxima constans, publici iuris nunquam facta, in Bibliotheca Regia Berolinensi asservatur.”

<sup>51</sup> Vgl. oben Anm. 15.

<sup>52</sup> Vgl. Anm. 15.

<sup>53</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 94, IV. Ha 1 (Konzept), Rep. 94, IV. Ha 1½ (Reinschrift).

XVIII,19 bis zu XVIII,43 und von XVIII,112 bis zu XIX,19. Die Reinschrift umfaßt 9 Einheiten, welche jene Teile des Konzepts enthalten: Buch II, III, V, VII, XI, XII, XIV, XVII und XIX. Es gibt nichts in der Reinschrift, was nicht auch im Konzept vorhanden wäre—ja, der Reinschrift fehlen sogar einige Bücher, die als Konzept vorhanden sind. Eines von diesen fehlenden Büchern der Reinschrift, das vierte, ist jenes Manuskript, das in die Staatsbibliothek gelangt ist, wie oben dargelegt wurde.

Doch trotz der Tatsache, daß Teissier weder seine vollständige Übersetzung noch das große oder das kleine *Abrégé* veröffentlicht sehen konnte, sondern sich mit der Publikation der wenigen Seiten seiner Übersetzung der Paragraphen der Geschichte Pufendorfs, in welchen die letzten Stunden von Friedrich Wilhelm beschrieben werden,<sup>54</sup> begnügen mußte, und trotz der sich daraus ergebenden Vermutung, daß Teissier nicht viel Macht besaß, würden wir uns doch ein falsches Bild von ihm machen, wenn wir ihn uns als einen vereinsamten Gelehrten ohne Anerkennung durch andere vorstellen wollten. Im Gegenteil beweisen die archivalische Quellen, daß er ein geachtetes und wichtiges Mitglied der französischen Gemeinschaft war. Er wurde nicht nur mehrere Male in gerichtliche Kommissionen berufen,<sup>55</sup> sondern wirkte auch als Vertrauensperson und als Vermittler zwischen wichtigen Staatsmännern wie z.B. Ezechiël Spanheim und Otto von Schwerin,<sup>56</sup> oder zwischen Spanheim und der französischen Gemeinschaft.<sup>57</sup> Tatsache ist aber, daß er als Autor keinen Erfolg hatte. Wie er selbst in einem Brief an Leibniz mit Bedauern und zugleich mit Resignation sagte:<sup>58</sup> "Le public s'intéresse fort peu à mes Ouvrages." ("Das Publikum ist sehr wenig an meinen Werken interessiert").

Ich bin mir sicher: hätte das Publikum Teissiers Übersetzung von Pufendorfs Geschichte gelesen, so hätte es ihm den Erfolg, nach dem er sich sehnte, ganz gewiß nicht verweigert. Wäre es nach drei

<sup>54</sup> Vgl. den Titel N. 4 in Anm. 34.

<sup>55</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 122. 7B II, N. 13: Die Dekrete von Kurfürst Friedrich III. vom 9.1.1695 (Bl. 1), vom 3.4.1695 (Bl. 34), vom 8. 12.1697 (Bl. 85–86).

<sup>56</sup> Otto II von Schwerin (1645–1705), Sohn des gleichnamigen Oberpräsidenten, wurde 1676 brandenburgisch-preußischer Staatsminister, später Gesandter in London.

<sup>57</sup> GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 122. 7B II, N. 13, Bl. 46 u. 65.

<sup>58</sup> Hannover, Nieder. Landesbl., Leibniz-Briefe 913, Bl. 2: Brief vom 19. Dez. 1705. Vgl. Anhang IV.

Jahrhunderten nun nicht endlich an der Zeit, die Veröffentlichung seiner Übersetzung in Angriff zu nehmen—nicht nur um den posthumen Ruf eines fast vergessenen Hugenotten zu verteidigen, sondern auch—und das vor allem—um mindestens eines der historischen Werke Pufendorfs der Vergessenheit zu entreißen?

*Anhang I*

Berlin GStAPK, I HA, Rep. 122, 3a, Nr. 5  
Bl. 23 r/v.<sup>59</sup>

Durchleüchtigster Churfürst, Gnädigster Herr; Eüwer Churfürstlicher Durchlaucht; Segen Unserer gantz unvertroster Dienste, jederzeit bereit Zuuor; Gnädigster Herr;

Demnach Überbringer diß, wegen der Euangelischen Glaubens-Lehr aus Franchreich Vertreibener Hr. Anthoni Teissers von Nimes, J.u.D. Welcher die fünff Jahr,<sup>60</sup> so er sich hinter Uns befunden, sich nicht nur durch seine Treffen-Lehr merites distinguiert, sondern auch eine sonderbahre Gelehrte, und exacte frommkeit in seiner Wandell spühren laßen, so das Wir veranlaaset worden Ihme in viel weg würcklich zubezeugen, wie hoch Wir seine Persohn aestimiren, Wir hetten auch wünschen mögen, das Er fehmers beij Uns verblieben were: Wann Er aber aus hochst tringenden ursachen, die Eijdtgnosenschaft zu verlaßen, seinen unterschlupf in Eüwer Churfürstlichen Durchlaucht Landen zusuchen, entschloßenen Vorhabens ist; Und wiewol ein solch Gelehrt- und Tugendtsammes subjectum, ohne einiges Fürwort beij Eüwer Churfürstlichen Durchlaucht Weltberühmten Clemens, sich erfreüwlicher Aufnahm zu verträsten hat; so haben Wir gleichwoln nicht vorbei gehen können, Benannten Herr Teissiers mit gegenwirthigem Recommendation-Schreiben zubegleiten; Und [23v] gelangt hiemit an Eüwer Churfürstliche Durchlaucht Unser dienstbefliestnestes ersuchen, Sie nach dero zu den Euangelischen Gläubens-Gnoßen steteshin trostrich bezeigt-hochrühmlich-erschallenen Neigung, gedachten Tessiers, in gehwohnten Gnaden aufzunehmen, und zu seiner établierung, einen gnädigsten willen zuerzeigen, gerühen wollten; Welches gegen Eüwer Churfürstlichen Durchlaucht Uns zu allen möglichsten dienstgefälligkeiten, sehr verpflichtet machen wirt; Inmittellß Eüwer Churfürstlichen Durchlaucht samt Hoch-loblichem Chur-Hauß, in Gottes Heilwerthem Obschutz zu beständigem hochem wol-Ergehen anbefehlen. Datum den 29.<sup>te</sup> Julij A.° 1692.

Eüwer Churfürstlichen Durchlaucht

Unterdienstwillige  
Bürgermeister und Rath  
Der Statt Zürich

<sup>59</sup> Ich bin meinem Freund, Herrn Dr. Eef Overgaauw, für die Überprüfung und Korrektur meiner Transkription dieses Briefes sehr dankbar.

<sup>60</sup> Hier berücksichtigt der Bürgermeister nur die Jahre, die Teissier in Zürich verbrachte, nicht aber jene, wo er in Bern gelebt hatte.

*Anhang II*

Berlin GStAPK, I HA Rep. 122, 3a, Nr. 5  
Bl. 24 r-v.

Antoine Teissier Docteur en Droit, et l'un des vingt et six Académiciens de l'Académie Royale de Nîmes, ayant été obligé d'abandonner sa patrie pour se dérober à la fureur des dragons françois, qui ont fait tomber tant de Reformez dans l'Apostasie, se retira à Zurich au Mois d'octobres de l'année 1685. Sans avoir fait aucune abjuration de la Sainte Religion dans laquelle il a été élevé, et il a vécu; Et quoy qu'il se trouvât denué de tous biens, il aima mieux y vivre dans un état misérable, que d'écouter les propositions qui luy furent faites de la part du Roy de France, qui luy offroit et la restitution de tous les biens qu'il avoit perdus par son Exil, et une pension de cinq cens écus, et des charges considérables, s'il vouloit retourner à son país.<sup>61</sup> Pour se consoler dans son malheur, il continua dans la Suisse les mêmes occupations qu'il avoit eües en France, et comme il avoit publié plusieurs Ouvrages en Latin et en François, il mit au jour de nouveaux Ecrits, l'un des quels fut dédié à Sa Serenité Electorale<sup>62</sup> de glorieuse

<sup>61</sup> Über diese Angebote von Ludwig XIV., die durch Pierre Chazel, 'Procureur du roi au présidial de Nîmes' und den Conseiller d'Etat Herrn d'Aguesseau gemacht wurden, vgl. die in footnote 3 genannte Biographie Teissiers.

<sup>62</sup> Exhortation Adressée aux Protestans contenant les raisons qui doivent les obliger à se réunir ensemble. Amsterdam: Charles Duchesne 1687.—Es handelt sich um eine Übersetzung des zweiten Teils des Buches von Johann Heinrich Heidegger, dem Zürcher Theologen, Freund und Förderer Teissiers: *In viam Concordiæ Protestantium Ecclesiasticæ Manuductio*. Amstelaedami: Apud Henricum Wetstenium 1687 (Tiguri 1686). Die Widmung an Kurfürst Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg lautet:

“A Son Altesse Electorale Monseigneur L'Electeur de Brandebourg.  
Monseigneur,

Comme Vôtre Altesse Electorale est le Prince de l'Europe qui sinteresse le plus dans la réunion des Protestans, et qui la souhaite avec le plus d'ardeur: il est bien juste que je lui adresse un ouvrage qui peut beaucoup contribuer à cette Sainte entreprise. Si j'étois l'Auteur de ce Traité, je n'aurois garde, Monseigneur, d'en parler si avantageusement, ni de présumer qu'il fût capable de produire un si grand effet. Mais comme il ne contient que les pensées et les raisonnemens d'un des plus pieux et des plus savans Théologiens qui fut jamais, je ne fais pas difficulté d'en dire du bien et mêmes de le dedier à Vôtre Altesse Electorale, étant persuadé qu'il n'est pas indigne de lui être offert. Soit que l'on considère l'érudition de l'illustre personnage qui l'a composé, ou que l'on regarde la matière qu'il contient. Lors que j'ai formé le dessein de m'approcher de Vôtre Altesse Electorale, j'ay oublié que j'étois un homme obscure, et qui lui étoit entièrement inconnu. Je n'ai pensé qu'au beau present que j'avois en main, et, pénétré de l'esperance du grand succès que je m'en promets, je n'ai pas douté, Monseigneur, que Vôtre Altesse Electorale, ne le reçu avec ioye, et que mêmes, elle ne me sût quelque gré de la peine que j'ai pris de faire parler ce grand homme en une langue que Vôtre Altesse Electorale parle avec tant d'éloquence, et qui est si fort en usage et dans ses Etats et dans



mémoire, père de Sa Serenité Electorale, qui règne aujourd'hui dans cet Etat. Ce livre fut présenté à ce grand prince, par Messieurs Brunsenius et Gautier,<sup>63</sup> qui se souviennent encore, que Sa Serenité Electorale les assûra,

---

tout le Septentrion. Je sai, Monseigneur, que Vôtre Altesse Electorale n'a rien tant à coeur que les interets de la gloire de Dieu, et que c'est luy faire un plus grand plaisir de luy donner le moyen d'avancer le Règne de Jesus-Christ, que de luy montrer le secret d'étendre les bornes de ses Provinces, et de se rendre maître de tout l'Univers. L'ambition dont Vôtre Altesse Electorale est remplie, est celle de mériter tous les Royaumes du Monde, et non pas celle de les posséder; d'avoir toutes les grandes qualitez des Conquerans, et de n'en avoir point les défauts, de savoir également vaincre ses Ennemis et se vaincre soi-même. Mais Monseigneur, ce qui fait le plus haut point de Vôtre gloire, et qui Vous attire l'admiration et les applaudissemens des hommes et des Anges, c'est cette liberalité sans bornes, cette immense charité qui Vous fait reprendre à plaines mains Vos thresors sur les pauvres membres du Seigneur, chassez de leur pais par les ennemis de l'Eglise, et qui vous oblige à leur tendre les bras, et à les recueillir dans vos Etats avec tant d'humanité et de bonté, qu'ils n'y sont pas plutôt entrez, qu'ils remercient leurs Persecuteurs de les avoir rendus les suiets d'un Prince si magnanime et si bienfaisant. Veuillez le Seigneur recompenser une si merveilleuse charité et tant de qualitez héroïques, de toutes les bénédictions qu'il a promises à la veritable pieté; Et comme il semble ne Vous avoir fait maître que pour le bien de son Eglise, Vous conserver pendant une longue suite d'années pour la consolation et pour la protection des ses enfans affligez. Ce sont les voeux, Monseigneur, qu'une infinité de Chrêtiens adressent tous les iours au Ciel pour la prosperité de Vôtre Altesse Electorale. Mais elle me permettra bien de luy dire, que dans ce nombre incroyable de personnes qui s'interessent pour tout ce qui la regarde, il n'y en a point qui le fasse avec tant d'ardeur, et si j'ose parler en des termes si familiers d'un si grand Prince, avec tant d'Amour que moy. Ouy, Monseigneur, quoi que je n'aye pas été témoin d'une si belle vie, je n'ai pas laissé d'en être le perpetuel admirateur, de la prendre pour l'objet de ma méditation et de mes louanges, et mêmes de me destiner d'en faire passer la mémoire à la posterité. Mon stile, à la vérité, n'est pas assez noble pour traiter comme il faut un sujet si grand et si relevé: Mais j'espère que la chaleur de mon Zèle suppléera au défaut de mon genie, et que du moins par ce moyen je pourrai temoigner à Vôtre Altesse Electorale, la parfaite Veneration que j'ai pour elle, et le profond respect avec lequel je suis, Monseigneur, De Vôtre Altesse Electorale

Le tres-humble et tres-obéissant  
Serviteur Teissier

A Zurich le 22. Juillet 1686."

<sup>63</sup> Anton Brunsenius (†1693), in Bremen geboren, war in Duisburg Lehrer der Söhne des Grafen Otto I. von Schwerin. 1680 kam er als Hofprediger nach Potsdam, 1683 war er Hofprediger in Berlin.

Was 'Gautier' betrifft, könnte es sich hier entweder um Thomas Gautier handeln (1638–1709), einen französischem Theologen und Freund Heideggers, der zuerst nach Genève und dann nach Zürich geflohen war, später Professor der Theologie in Marburg wurde, oder um François Gaultier de Saint Blancard (†1703), dessen Name oft auch als 'Gautier' geschrieben wird. Dieser letztere war Pastor in Montpellier, als Réfugié kam er in die Schweiz, nach Holland und schliesslich nach Brandenburg, wo er eine glänzende Karriere machte und sehr mächtig wurde. Ich nehme an, daß es sich um diesen handelt, weil Teissier von jemandem spricht, der dem Kurfürsten sehr vertraut wäre.

qu'elle donneroit à l'Auteur des marque effectives de sa bienveillance, sil venoit s'établir dans ses Etats. Mais parcequ'il avoit dessein de retirer un Enfant qu'il avoit laissé en France,<sup>64</sup> et qu'il vouloit tacher de sauver quelque pièces du debris de son naufrage, il luy fut alors impossible de venir en ce payci, quoy qu'il eut un ardent desir de se consacrer au service de Sa Serenité electorale, et que même il se fut voué à écrire l'histoire de ses Exploits Héroïques, comme il parôit par l'Epître du livre qu'il luy a dedié. Les raisons qui le retenoient en Suisse ne subsistant plus,<sup>65</sup> il s'est transporté en cette ville avec toute sa famille, dans la vëue d'y passer le reste de ses [Bl. 24v] jours, et d'employer son tems à écrire l'histoire du Grand Héros, dont il s'etoit proposé de fair passer la mémoire à la posterité. Mais ayant appris que Mr. Pufendorf avoit composé en Latin la vie de ce Prince incomparable, et étoit en état de la publier au prémier jour, il n'a pas douté que cette matière, quoy qu'extrêmement riche, ne fût entièrement épuisée par ce bel Ouvrage, et il a vû que tout ce qui luy pouvoit rester à faire en cette occasion, étoit de la traduire en une des plus belles langues vivantes, c'est à dire en françois. S'il est assez heureux pour être honoré de cet Employ, il s'y attachera avec tant d'application, qu'il espère que le desir, qu'il aura de repondre à la dignité du Héros, et à l'Eloquence de l'Auteur, et la peine qu'il prendra pour se bien acquiter de ce travail, supleeront au defaut de son esprit et de sa capacité. Que si Dieu luy fait la grace de fournir cette carrière, il pourra en suite s'exerçer sur le louanges du glorieux Successeur de l'illustre Frideric Guillaume.

A Berlin le 1. Nov. 1692

---

<sup>64</sup> Es handelt sich um einen fünf Monate alten Säugling, welcher der Tochter aus der ersten Ehe seiner Frau (Susanne Cambon, verhelichte des Pierres) anvertraut worden war und der ein Jahr nach der am 24. September 1685 erfolgten Flucht seiner Eltern starb.

<sup>65</sup> Aber der wirkliche Grund für Teissiers Umsiedlung von Zürich nach Berlin war der, daß seine beiden Söhne, die inzwischen in der Schweiz geboren wurden, dort als Ausländer keine Karriere machen konnten.

*Anhang III*

GStAPK, I HA, Rep. XI, 34, Fasc. 4: Briefe Wartenburgs und Printz's betr. den von Teissier verfaßten Aufzug aus der Geschichte des Großen Kurfürst von Puffendorf

[Bl. 1r:]<sup>66</sup>

Beil[iegender] Fragment einer Historie der Churfürsten von Brandenburg von Teissier habe nebst beil[iegender] Briefen unter meines Grosvaters des HoffRath Chuno Papieren annoch gefunden; ich weiß nicht ob solches zum Archiv gehöret, habe es aber des Königl. Kriegs Rath Herrn Schlüter Wohlgeb[orenen] gehorsamst übersenden wollen, zugl[eich] füge eine unter H. Sußmilchs<sup>67</sup> Papieren gefundene Theoria[??] bey.

Liptow<sup>68</sup>

Berlin den 27 Aug[ust] [17]69

[Anmerkung von Hand eines Archivars]

Ist das . . . [unlesbar] . . . [unlesbar]

de 1747 . . . [unlesbar]

. . . [unlesbar]

Einlage ist nicht d. Extract v. Pufendorff de R[ebus] G[estis] Fr[iderici] Wilh[elmi] sondern Copie v.d. schon gedruckten Abrege de l'histoire de Brandenb.,<sup>69</sup> welche also nicht zu asserviren nöthig; die Br[ief]e v. Gr[af] Wartenberg, H. v. Printzen u. Teissier schon reponiert ad XI Nr. 34

[Bl. 2 eigenhändige Abschrift von Teissier]

Monsieur

On m'a raporté que vous avez examiné le Cahier du Manuscript Historique de Monsieur Teissier, que je vous ay fait adresser de Custrin, pour en examiner le contenu, Et après quelque changemens vous l'avez trouvé digne qu'il soit rendu public, d'autant plus qu'il n'y avoit riens dans le dit Traité qui fut contraire à la verité de l'histoire, ou prejudiciable aux interets ou vues de notre Cour. Ceci etant, Monsieur, le Sr. Teissier a la liberté de faire imprimer son travail, et il n'a qu'à chercher quelque libraire, qui en fasse la depense. Le privilege luy sera acordé. Je suis avec estime, Monsieur

Votre tres humble

Serviteur

Wartenberg

<sup>66</sup> Ich bin Herrn Prof. Dr. Tilo Brandis und Frau Helga Döhn für ihre Hilfe bei der Entzifferung dieser Handschrift (und jener des M.L. von Printzen [Bl. 8r] sehr zu Dank verpflichtet.

<sup>67</sup> Johann Peter Süßmilch (1706–1767), Theologe, Konsistorialrat.

<sup>68</sup> Der Name ist evtl. als 'Liptow' zu entziffern. Leider ließ sich über diesen Enkel von Johann Jacob Chuno nichts ermitteln.

<sup>69</sup> Es handelt sich um den in Anm. 34 zitierten Titel N. 4: Abregé de l'histoire des Electeurs de Brandebourg.

A Magdebourg le 22 d'Octobre 1704  
 A Monsieur Monsieur  
 Cuneau, Conseiler de Sa  
 Majesté A Berlin

J'ai l'original  
 Teissier  
 Le 1. Nov. 1704

[Bl. 4 Brief an Mon<sup>r</sup>. Couneau:]  
 Monsieur,

Mon<sup>r</sup>. Teissier insiste da son cy-joint Memoire, que l'Abregé (das große abregé), qu'il a fait de l'Histoire de feu Mon<sup>r</sup>. De Puffendorff sur la vie de Frederic Guillaume le Grand, soit examiné et ensuite rendu publicq. Il est wray, que quand a l'examen de cet ouvrage il n'aueroit pû choisir des personnes plus propres qu'il a fait. Mais comme la d<sup>te</sup> Histoire a fait du bruit, Mon<sup>r</sup>. d'Ilgen aussibien que moy jugions mieux, que cet abregé, quand il sera achevé par M<sup>r</sup> Teissier soit asservé dans l'Archiv et qu'il ne soit pas imprimé dans les conjonctures presentes. Vous aurez la bonté de le faire comprendre à Mon<sup>r</sup>. Teissier, et je suis toujours

Monsieur  
 Votre tres humble  
 Serviteur  
 Wartenberg

à Potsdam  
 le 7 may 1707

[Bl. 5r:]

Memoire d'Antoine Teissier Conseiller des Ambassades, et Historiographe de Sa Majesté:

Le dit Teissier a fait l'Abregé de l'Histoire de l'Electeur Frederic Guillaume de glorieuse memoire, composée par M<sup>r</sup> de Pufendorf. Cet ouvrage contienda [sic! contiendra] un mediocre volume in quarto.

Comme on a porté diverses plaintes contre cette Histoire, il seroit sans doute necessaire que cet Abregé fut examiné avec soin par des personnes très versées dans ces sortes de chose la. Ainsi son Excellence, Monseigneur le Grand Chambellan est très humblement supplié d'ordonner la dessus ce qu'Elle trouvera à propos.

Le dit Teissier communiqua il y a quelques tems, le manuscrit de cet Ouvrage à Messieurs de Sturme et Cuno, qui y ont fait quelque Remarques.  
 [Bl. 8r:]

Ich communicire hierbey dem H. HoffRatt Chuno was der Königl. LegationsRatt Teissier wegen eines in Druck herauszugebänden tractats, so ein Abregé der Puffendorffs Historie von Fredrich Wilhelm den großen seyn soll, an Sr. K. M. unterthänigst vorgestellt und gebethen, und weilen Sr. K. M. darauff ein letzten geheimbden[?] Ratt Allernädigst resolviret, daß der H. HoffRatt Chuno solches Abrege vorhero durchgehen und seine

notata darüber machen auch sein pflichtsmaßiges Guthachten ob solches zu publiciren beyfugen möchte, daß wird der H. HoffRatt woll die gutheit haben und diesen Tractat von H. Teissier abfordern und durchgehen auch mir ohnbeschwer die darüber guthgefundene notata zusenden, welches hernachmahlen von denen samtlichen würcklichen Geh. Etats Rätthe nach Sr. K. M. Allergndigsten befehl erwogen[?] werden sollen. Berlin d. 3ten Octobris 1714

M. L. von Printzen

[auf Blatt 11v:]

An den Konigl. HoffRatt und . . . [unlesbar] Geheimenden[?] Archivario H. Chuno

[Bl. 9r:]

Sire

Antoine Teissier, Conseiller d'Ambassade et Historiographe de Votre Majesté, luy represente avec un profond respect, Qu'outre sa traduction francoise de l'excellente Histoire du grand Electeur Frederic Guillaume Ayeul de Votre Majesté, composée en Latin, par Mr. de Pufendorf et contenant deux gros volumes in folio, il a fait un Abregé de cette meme Histoire, qui marque les glorieuses actions de ce grand Heros, et dont la lecture ne peut etre que très agreable à Votre Majesté. Sur tout le récit de ses exploits guerriers et Héroiques. Ainsi il suplie très humblement Votre Majesté d'ordonner que cet Abregé, qui ne fera qu'un volume in 4° soit incessamment imprimé, afin que la mémoire de ce glorieux Heros soit transmise jusqu'à la posterité la plus éloignée. Et le supliant ne cessera de prier Dieu pour la prosperité de votre Majesté, et de sa Royale Maison.

[Bl. 10v:]

Requete de Ant. Teissier  
Historiographe du Roi

*Anhang IV*

Zwei Briefe Teissiers an Leibniz  
 Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek  
 LBr. 913, Bl. 1–4:

[Bl. 1]

Monsieur

Comme par la lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'écrire vous me demandez a quoy je m'occupe presentement, je vous diray que je travaille à quelques vies des savans de notre Religion et de ceux qui l'ont favorisée, et que j'ay déjà achevé celles de Pierre du Moulin, Ministre de Paris premièrement puis de Sedan, d'Isaac Casaubon, de Claude Saumaise, de M. de Thou l'Historien, et de Savonarola.<sup>70</sup> J'ay aussi depuis peu fait un gros Apendix à mon Catalogue d'Auteurs,<sup>71</sup> dont on à commencée d'imprimer la Seconde partie à Geneve, mais dont l'impression à été [Bl. 2] discontinuée depuis trois ou quatre ans. Le publique s'interesse fort peu à mes Ouvrages. Mais pour les vôtres, Monsieur, les gens de lettres les atendent toujours avec beaucoup d'impatience, comme partant d'un homme qui fait tant d'honneur à la Republique des lettres et qui en est un des plus grands ornemens.

Je suis avec respect,

Monsieur  
 Vosres tres humble et tres  
 obeissant serviteur  
 Teissier

---

<sup>70</sup> Diese Biographien erwähnt Teissiers Biograph auch unter den von Teissier hintelassenen Papieren. Sie wurden ebenfalls nie veröffentlicht, und meiner Kenntnis nach sind sie nicht überliefert worden.

<sup>71</sup> Antoine Teissier: *Catalogus auctorum qui librorum catalogos, indices, bibliothecas, virorum literatorum vitas . . . scriptis consignarunt*. Genève: Samuel de Tournes 1686; A. Teissier: *Catalogi . . . Auctarium*. Genève 1705.

Le 19. Dec. 1705

[Bl. 3]

Monsieur

Comme vous etes le protecteur des gens de lettres, et qu'en mon particulier j'ay recu des marques très obligeantes de la bienveillance dont vous m'honorez, je me flatte que vous serez bien aisé que je vous fournisse l'occasion de me rendre un bon office. Monsieur le Comte de Dona,<sup>72</sup> pendant qu'il étoit gouverneur de Monseigneur le Prince Royal, me fit une pension de soixante écus pour m'engager a faire divers Ouvrages pour l'usage de son Altesse Royale. Cette pension m'a été continuée depuis que Monsieur le Comte est en Prusse: Mais comme [Bl. 4] Monseigneur le Prince Royal<sup>73</sup> a tourné toutes ses inclinations du coté de la guerre, et qu'il paroît ne faire pas grand cas des livres, ni de ceux qui en composent, j'aprehende qu'il ne trouve que le peu qu'il me donne est mal employé. Ainsi je vous supplie tres humblement, Monsieur, de dire un mot an ma faveur à Madame la Princesse d'Hanover,<sup>74</sup> a fin de la porter à soutenir mes petits interets auprès de Monseigneur le Prince Royal son futur épouse, et meme a augmenter cette petite pension. J'espere que vous ne refuserez pas cette grace à un homme qui vous est entierément devoué, qui vous honnore infiniment, et qui est avec un profond respect,

Monsieur

A Berlin le 20. Juill. 1706

Votre tres humble et tres  
obeissant serviteur  
Teissier

Je crois, Monsieur, qu'il ne faut pas que Madame la Princesse sache que j'ay quelque defiance touchant ma pension, et qu'il sufira de la prier qu'Elle ait la bonté de me maintenir dans les bonnes graces de Monseigneur le Prince Royal, afin que moy et les miens puissions toujours joui [sic! jouir] des efets de sa liberalité.

---

<sup>72</sup> Alexander von Dohna (1661–1728), Wirklicher Geheimer Rat, später Generalfeldmarschall, der am 25. Februar 1695 Oberhofmeister des Kurprinzen Friedrich Wilhelm wurde. Vgl. die Rede des Ministers Paul von Fuchs und Dohnas Antwort anlässlich seines Amtsantritts in: *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans* (wie Anm. 10), 1696, Mars et April, Art. VI, S. 163–68 u. art. VII, S. 168–69.—Im Jahr 1699 war Dohna (als Nachfolger von Ezechiel Spanheim) Präsident des Konsistoriums der französischen Kolonie geworden.

<sup>73</sup> Der zukünftige König Friedrich Wilhelm I. von Preußen (1688–1740).

<sup>74</sup> Sophie Dorothea von Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Hannover (1687–1757), die am 28. November 1706 den künftigen König Friedrich Wilhelm I. heiratete.

This page intentionally left blank



NATURAL RIGHT, LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE AND  
“SUMMA POTESTAS” IN JEAN BARBEYRAC\*

Fabrizio Lomonaco

1

With Pufendorf and Locke, Barbeyrac shares the demand of an ethic founded upon certain laws, which can be demonstrated deductively like physical laws. Legal obligation guarantees the functioning of the human mind as well as human morality. From this point of view, it cannot be sufficient to provide a criterion of rational evidence, like Bayle did, as autonomous source of value. A legitimation of the *atheism* results from practical reason in a Baylean sense, which establishes the absolute value of ethical principles in the conscience of the individual. In their denial of God, the atheists reject, according to Barbeyrac and Locke, the very idea of natural right and the principle of liberty of conscience as a consequence of it. Atheism and its libertine effects tend to invalidate the ethical ideals of society and trust in the moral character of human community: “(. . .) Mais épurez tant qu’il vous plaira l’athéisme; jamais vous n’en tirerez que des conséquences pernicieuses, qui mènent tout droit au plus grand libertinage”.<sup>1</sup> In his commentary to Book II of Pufendorf’s *De iure naturae et gentium* (1734), Barbeyrac confronts Bayle’s thesis with the constraints, which Grotius had set to his own hypothesis. The author

---

\* The following essay is the English translation of passages from my book: *Tolleranza e libertà di coscienza. Filosofia, diritto e storia tra Leida e Napoli nel secolo XVIII*. Napoli: Liguori editore 1999, pp. 93–123. On the subject and, in general, on the matters here examined, see this volume (a partial German translation of the book has appeared, with the title “Jean Barbeyrac als Ausleger Pufendorfs. Natürliches Recht und Gewissensfreiheit”, in: *Die Hermeneutik im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, eds. M. Beetz and G. Cacciatori, Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau Verlag 2000, pp. 197–207).

<sup>1</sup> See *Le droit de la nature et des gens, ou Système général des principes les plus importants de la morale, de la jurisprudence, et de la politique*, par le Baron de Pufendorf, traduit du latin par Jean Barbeyrac (. . .), Amsterdam: la veuve de Coup, 1734, V ed. (hereafter cited as *Le droit*), book II, chap. 3, § XIX, note 2 (t. I, p. 232).

of *De iure belli ac pacis*, in emphasizing that the *rules* of natural right “*auraient lieu en quelque manière*”, underlined the chief relationship of the “*idées de convenance ou disconvenance*”, which are founded upon human nature, with God’s will.<sup>2</sup> Thus, Barbeyrac, far from Bayle’s unacceptable deductions, sets out to define the basis of moral obligation and relative natural law through the appeal to the laws of a *Superior* legislator. In this context, it is interesting to look at Barbeyrac’s criticism of the admired Pufendorf in his French version of *De officio hominis et civis* (1707). In a footnote, he stressed the weakness of Pufendorf’s *iustae causae*, which justify the right to impose an obligation: “Cette variation et cette confusion est déjà un préjugé désavantageux pour la justesse de ses idées: mais si on examine toutes les raisons qu’il établit pour fondement du droit dont il est question, on verra aisément, qu’il n’y en a aucune qui par elle-même ait assez de force”. The *vis* of divine superior legislation, which guarantees one single and definite dimension of the law, results into a real obligation of human conscience. That means, it establishes the ethical character of the legal tie that imposes the respect of the *duties*. This enables Barbeyrac to accept an interpretation, which Pufendorf seems to put forth, when he stresses, for instance, the inadequacy of the factor “generation” to sanction the power over the children. If the parents are “des instruments aveugles” and “des causes, pour ainsi dire, occasionelles” of human life, their authority derives from an another force, which is divine by nature, and is responsible for the creation of human soul and body. Therefore, God is able to prescribe certain limitations of all human faculties, whichever he deems necessary, and he is responsible for the setting the framework in which they are used. This “consensus”, which is the basis of the “just” power of the laws and every legitimate *auctoritas* among men, draws all of its force from Divine in order to establish the respectability of promises and commitments: “Voilà le grand et premier fondement de tout Devoir et de toute Obligation”.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Le droit, p. 230. See F. Palladini: Volontarismo e “laicità” del diritto naturale. La critica di S. Pufendorf a Grozio. *De iure belli ac pacis*, Prol. 11 e I, 1, 10, in: Reason in Law. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Bologna (December 12–15 1984), Milan: Giuffrè 1988, vol. III, pp. 401–402.

<sup>3</sup> Les devoirs de l’homme et du citoyen, tels qu’ils lui sont prescrits par la loi naturelle, traduits du latin du Baron de Pufendorf, par Jean Barbeyrac (. . .), Amsterdam, chez la veuve de P. de Coup, & G. Kuyper 1735, V édition (here-

Barbeyrac's choice to make the necessary criterions of action and of conscience in natural law dependent on divine obligation leads to explicitly voluntaristic reading of Pufendorf's doctrine of natural law. In his commentary on and correction of the definition of law in the *De officio*, the translator states: "Cette définition de la *loi*, prise dans son idée la plus générale, n'est pas assez pleine ni assez exacte". Instead, he suggests, the law is a Superior's will's manifestation in the world. It controls all actions of its subjects (or at least those of a certain type) to an extent which results into the necessity to act or not to act in a certain way, leaving, nevertheless, to the men "*la liberté d'agir ou de ne point agir, comme ils le jugeront à propos*". In order to avoid the introduction into his ethics of arbitrary principles, Barbeyrac had to choose the concept of a divine, "superior" legislator, who is author and basis of the relationship between norm and sanction, instead of a human legislator. In fact, only God has the power to direct all men in all of their actions, unlike every other forms of superiors, who intervene only on actions of a "certain type" and can never go beyond their limited power.<sup>4</sup> The natural laws themselves depend "originellement de l'*institution divine*", on God's will; they are founded on the wisdom and goodness of the Summum Bonum, which cannot contradict itself and which would not push Man towards a goal without, at the same time, forcing him to adjust his actions to the anticipated purpose.<sup>5</sup> The order of the divinely created universe is not merely a given fact, but needs to be achieved by human reason. It imposes upon his conscience the obligation to submit to this order; that means, it exists as a demand, which stems from his rational nature. Men have to align their actions along the lines of certain laws, which reason is able to identify as divine obligations. Therefore, Barbeyrac's reason-conscience entails, like Locke's, the entirety of those practical principles, which conform to divine law.

But Barbeyrac's God, who is the ultimate foundation of natural law, is no longer the God of the traditional revealed religions. From this point of view, the French legal theorist's discourse is based on

---

after cited as *Devoirs*), book I, chap. 2, § V, note 3 (t. I, pp. 41–43). See F. Palladini: *Samuel Pufendorf discepolo di Hobbes. Per una reinterpretazione del giusnaturalismo moderno*. Bologna: il Mulino 1990, pp. 49–67 and note 20 (p. 86).

<sup>4</sup> *Devoirs*, book I, chap. 2, § II, note 1 (t. I, pp. 36–38).

<sup>5</sup> *Le droit*, book I, chap. 1, § IV, note 4 (t. I, p. 5). See S. Zurbuchen: *Naturrecht und natürliche Religion. Zur Geschichte des Toleranzproblems von Samuel Pufendorf bis Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann 1991, pp. 125–139.

the authentic preconditions of the natural law doctrine, which do not undermine the strict separation of faith of reason, law and theology. Therefore, the reference to the compound of human conscience and reason leads to those risky implications, which were known in previous religious literature. By affirming divine obligation, the supremacy of conscience does no longer justify the exaltation of “revelation” to a level, which enables faith to cause harmful behaviour within civil society. This divine obligation does not create a distance between law and reality, because it thrives within a human context by regulating social interaction. By conceptualizing the law in terms of obligation, Barbeyrac attempts to nourish essentially human values and to strengthen from the inside consciously moral action. The voluntaristic perspective, taken by him in his commentary on Pufendorf, leads to an acknowledgement of God, but excludes faith. That means, it leads to the abandonment of dogmatic theology and assigns instead to this theory of obligation the task of guaranteeing universal ethical values of the conscience.

This leads to a secularization and rationalization of the ethics, which Pufendorf’s commentator attempted to defend against Leibniz’s detailed criticism espoused in the *Monita quaedam ad principia pufendorfiani operis De officio hominis et civis* (1709), which was translated and published in an appendix to the French version of the *De officio* in 1718.<sup>6</sup> In the corresponding *Réflexions* Barbeyrac criticised the German philosopher’s argument for not having linked the rules of human action and the nature of the Just with divine will. According to Barbeyrac, Leibniz had based the principle of natural right not on God’s will but his intellect, not so much on his *auctoritas*, but on more benign *sapientia*. Justice, according to Leibniz’ *Monita*, depended on the rules

---

<sup>6</sup> Composed in 1706, Leibniz’s contribution appeared in the appendix to the volume: I. Ch. Boehmer: *Programma disputationibus XII pufendorfianis ab Io. Christoph. Leonhard Gera-Varisco respondente in iis perpetuo publice instituendis praemissum herausgegeben. Accedit Epistola viri excellentissimi ad amicum qua monita quaedam ad principia Pufendorfiani operis De officio hominis et civis continentur, Helmstadii, ex officina hammiana 1709*, French translation with the title, *Jugement d’un anonyme, sur l’original de cet abrégé. Avec des réflexions du traducteur* (1716; hereafter cited as *Jugement*), in *Devoirs*, t. II, pp. 379–435. The Italian translation is in G. W. Leibniz, *Scritti politici e di diritto naturale*, edited by V. Mathieu, Turin: Utet 1951, pp. 247–260. On the response to the *Monita* and on the significance of the polemic with Pufendorf see—also for the understanding of Barbeyrac’s position—N. Bobbio: *Leibniz e Pufendorf* (1947), in: *Da Hobbes a Marx*. Naples: Morano 1965, pp. 129–145.

of "equity" and "proportion", which are exclusively based on the "unchangeable nature of things and on the ideas of the divine intellect."<sup>7</sup> To confirm his critical judgment of Pufendorf, Leibniz had introduced a comparison with Grotius. Grotius had properly established the connection between the "doctrina scholasticorum de lege Dei aeterna" and the principle of "socialitas", but eliminated from the law of God the concept of transcendence, thus making it coincide with the *ius naturale*. By making *socialitas* into a constitutive principle (*principium essendi*) of law, Grotius had advanced the definite separation of law from theology. According to Leibniz, this separation was impossible for Pufendorf, who had instituted *ratio* not as *principium essendi*, but solely as *principium cognoscendi*.<sup>8</sup> In return, Barbeyrac defended Pufendorf by his insistence on the insufficiency of the "rules of justice" to establish moral ties. Along these lines he resumes and reevaluates Pufendorf's thought: "(...) Mais il soutient, qu'avec tout cela, la raison propre et directe pourquoi les hommes sont *obligés* de suivre les règles de la justice, ce qui leur impose la *nécessité* morale de s'y conformer, c'est la volonté de Dieu, qui en qualité de leur maître souverain, a plein droit de gêner leur liberté naturelle, comme il le juge à propos". The theoretical presupposition of this passage was the necessity to maintain a distinction between law and theology, God's justice and human justice, which are different in their origin and extension. Among human beings *iustitia* is a quality that Men must and can acquire only through the obligation that imposed on them by an external principle, namely God's *will*.<sup>9</sup>

This did not remain without echo, as the prompt review of the translation of *De officio* in the "Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne" (1718) testifies. In his review, Jean Le Clerc, focusing on the issue

---

<sup>7</sup> *Jugement*, p. 411. See R. Sève: *Leibniz et l'école moderne du droit naturel*. Paris: P.U.F. 1989, pp. 59–67.

<sup>8</sup> Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz to Friedrich Wilhelm Bierling, Hanoverae, July 7 1711, in: G. W. Leibniz: *Die philosophischen Schriften*, ed. C. I. Gerhardt. Hildesheim-New York: G. Olms Verlag 1978, vol. VII, letter 5, p. 498 and letter 2, p. 488. See A. Droetto, *Studi groziani*, ed. by N. Bobbio. Turin: Giappichelli 1968, pp. 297–298.

<sup>9</sup> *Jugement*, pp. 413, 405–406. On Barbeyrac and the contradictions among the "rationalism" of his theory of the conscience and the defence of Pufendorf's "voluntarism" see T. Hochstrasser: *The Claims of Conscience: Natural Law Theory, Obligation, and Resistance in the Huguenot Diaspora*, in: *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. by J. Ch. Laursen. Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1995, p. 46.

of the definition of the “efficient cause of the law”, shared the voluntaristic interpretation, thus exalting the historical-critical value of Pufendorf’s natural law doctrine: “On n’a qu’à lire Mr. *Barbeyrac*, et l’on conviendra que Mr. de *Pufendorf* ne pouvait pas être censuré”.<sup>10</sup>

In his commentary, Barbeyrac does not limit himself to oppose Leibniz with arguments for a secularized natural law doctrine, but he sets out to defend his master Pufendorf from the accusation of legitimising a Hobbesian model through his appeal to the Superior legislator. The acceptance of voluntarism, so go the accusations, alters the basis of natural right, which risks to be sanctioned by the *imperium* of a coercive power. Accepting such sanctions means to admit that obligations come true only when a Superior imposes them. If divine obligation is enough to create Law, it is able, at the same time, to justify a tyrannical government, as does Trasymachus in Plato’s Republic. In response to Leibniz’s critique, Barbeyrac emphasized the intimate relationship between law and morality. All the juridical norms attest to a value, which is morally binding. This *obligatio*, which implies an internal responsibility, is distinct from an immediate and exterior pressure. Not coincidentally, the French translator seems strongly committed to show that the “volonté de Dieu” is never arbitrary. It always reveals itself in relationship with human nature, which is founded upon its obligations in opposition to the criterion of the utility in the Hobbesian model: “L’anonyme [Leibniz] (...) confond visiblement l’honnête, avec l’utile; et cela paraît d’ailleurs par l’exemple qu’il allègue d’une *société de brigands* (...). Mais (...) il ne s’agit point ici d’utilité, il s’agit de *devoir* et d’*obligation*”.<sup>11</sup>

Pufendorf’s doctrine, rigorously interpreted in the light of anti-Hobbesian “voluntarism”, could result into the discovery of different possibilities of convergence among *motivation* and *obligation*. However, the point of departure remained the same, namely the acceptance of their modern conflict, in contrast to the traditional finalism of the Aristotelian and scholastic theories. The basis of natural law has to be recognised as the obligation, imposed by the divine legislator’s will, the absolute guarantee of validity and autonomy of individual conscience. Liberty of man, which springs from the bottom of his nature, does not find in external reality anything that has the force

<sup>10</sup> See: “Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne”, IX, 1718, t. II, pp. 457, 459.

<sup>11</sup> Jugement, pp. 415–416.

of obligation. The very relationships of "convenience", "order", "beauty" and "honesty", at which the definition of justice arrives, remain only abstract, speculative ideas, unless we don't succeed in recognising God as the author of the "nature of things and of reason". He reveals them to men and approves them; he wants that Men adjust their external and internal actions: "Là commence le *devoir*; la volonté de l'être souverainement parfait est la règle de la nôtre, et celui qui nous a fait tout ce que nous sommes, peut sans doute exiger que nous ne fassions pas tout ce dont il pourrait nous prendre envie".<sup>12</sup>

Himself a theoretician of the individual and inalienable right of the "liberté de conscience", this attempted assimilation of Hobbesian thought, must have appeared even riskier for Barbeyrac. This freedom of conscience resulted from Hobbes's theory, which aimed to guarantee the survival of a "public conscience", which coincides with the law of the sovereign power, with the authority and the rationality of the State as theorized in the *Leviathan*.<sup>13</sup> After all, Pufendorf's interpretation, which Barbeyrac supported, became anti-Hobbesian in the course of its whole argument. In fact, Barbeyrac attributed to Pufendorf solutions, which often conflicted with the tendency of Pufendorf's natural law doctrine, up to the extent that he sustained that "la nuit et le jour ne sont pas plus opposés, que les systèmes de Machiavel et d'Hobbes, d'un côté; et ceux de Grotius et de Pufendorf, de l'autre".<sup>14</sup> Among the issues discussed here, it seems most interesting to me to look at those critical notes in the commentary on *De iure naturae et gentium*, which denounce Pufendorf's precariousness with regards to the foundation of the right of superiority of God to men. To argue—as the German jurist did—that we can demand from others (in the sense of a "jus perfectum") only what we have agreed upon, bears the risk of assigning, in a Hobbesian

<sup>12</sup> Jugement, pp. 430–431.

<sup>13</sup> Th. Hobbes: *Leviathan* (1651), Italian translation by A. Pacchi in collaboration with A. Lupoli, Rome-Bari: Laterza 21992, part II, chap. 29, pp. 264–265. On Barbeyrac's critique of Hobbesian Pufendorf and on Leibniz's judgement see M. Mori: *Giusnaturalismo e crisi dell'ordine naturale*, in: *Rivista di filosofia* LXXVII, 1986, 1, pp. 16–29.

<sup>14</sup> *Le droit de la guerre et de la paix* par Hugues Grotius. Nouvelle traduction, par Jean Barbeyrac (. . .). Leide, aux dépens de la Compagnie, 1759 (hereafter cited as DGP), Préface du traducteur, p. XXXII. See F. Palladini: *Samuel Pufendorf discepolo di Hobbes . . .*, pp. 277–278.

manner, to force an essential role in the constitution of law. According to Barbeyrac, this would be a dangerous and unacceptable consequence, and he points to the need to correct Pufendorf in this matter. Force does not appear in what constitutes the right to impose obligation. It serves only to make valid that *ius*, that never fades away, even if the Superior is deprived of the necessary forces to make use of it.<sup>15</sup> Obligation exists, therefore, in all of its potential and extension, independently from any possible sanctions. Besides, to argue that divine action effects itself on a human nature already bound to the obedience of the absolute command, means to introduce the divine will as something accessory and to reduce it to that of a *princeps*, a father, a master or of another worldly superior. If, however, God proposes his *will* instead, as a model to imitate, then “it remains to be demonstrated that he does not demand from Men anything that he himself does not own, as is required by his sovereign perfections; and not to reveal himself, therefore, as a *severe master*.”<sup>16</sup>

## 2

The central theme of the obligation on the theoretical level corresponds to the necessity to deepen the relationship between the power of the civil *auctoritas* and the prerogatives of the *conscience* on the historical-juridical level. All efforts to guarantee a juridical and rational basis for absolutism collided with the complicated attempt to reconcile the two theoretical demands of obedience and liberty, of *auctoritas* and conscience. The problem that Barbeyrac intended to solve differently from Hobbes was to link individual liberty as it appears in civil life with the recognition of a real and responsible political authority. This perspective helped him recognize that John Locke’s theoretical and political thought could serve as his guide. Stimulated by the theories of the English philosopher and the premises of natural law doctrine, which he never abandoned, he was able to refuse not absolutism *tout court* but only its harmful transformation into despotism. Although he recognized the right of freedom of conscience, Barbeyrac confined himself to a definition of the problems of *summa potestas*. The intention was to establish possible points of

---

<sup>15</sup> Devoirs, book I, chap. 2, § V, note 2 (t. I, p. 40).

<sup>16</sup> Jugement, p. 419.



reference as necessary markers for the choices of conscience. In confirmation of such a thesis and in opposition to the Hobbesian definition of unique and indivisible *summa potestas*, Barbeyrac pleaded for a separation of the powers in the *imperium*. The drawbacks of this choice were, in his opinion, always preferable to the risks of a despotic power. Commenting on Pufendorf's *De officio*, which embraced the dangerous Hobbesian doctrines, he observed: "Mais comme l'expérience fait voir qu'on abuse facilement d'une puissance étendue, les inconveniens qui naissent du partage de quelques-uns des droits de la souveraineté, seront toujours beaucoup moindres, que ceux auxquels on est exposé par la régularité dont parle notre auteur, laquelle n'est bonne qu'en idée".<sup>17</sup> In his notes to *De iure naturae et gentium*, he rejected the definition, which viewed sovereignty as a simple and indivisible institution, as an opinion that seemed to be based upon a false hypothesis. Instead, *summa potestas* is, according to Barbeyrac, the unified mass of different rights and powers, aiming towards one single goal: the good of society. Therefore, nothing prevents that they are held by separate subjects, as long as they are present in the State's body without being subdued to the will of a foreign power.<sup>18</sup> But for Barbeyrac, Pufendorf and Locke's disciple, a people does not cede *summa potestas* without reserving itself the right to reclaim it, if the *princeps* abuses his *auctoritas*; in that case, it would oppose the state's actual aims: "Mais il ne s'ensuit (. . .), qu'on l'ait [le pouvoir] conféré d'une manière à ne se réserver en aucun cas le droit de le reprendre. Cette réserve est quelquefois *expresse*: et il y en a toujours une *tacite*, dont l'effet se déploie, lors que celui à qui on a conféré le pouvoir, en abuse d'une manière directement et notablement contraire à la fin pour laquelle il lui a été".<sup>19</sup> The individual and *summa potestas* lead a peaceful coexistence without hampering or hindering themselves and they engage in clearly diversified rights and duties.

<sup>17</sup> Devoirs, book II, chap. 7, § IX, note 1 (t. II, p. 307).

<sup>18</sup> Le droit, book VII, chap. 4, § I, note 1 (t. II, p. 317).

<sup>19</sup> DGP, book I, chap. 3, § VIII, note 1, p. 121. The "right to resist" in Barbeyrac, the theoretical and political locus where Pufendorf's and Locke's motives meet, has been acutely analysed by S. Zurbuchen: Jaucourt, Republicanism, and Toleration, in *New Essays . . .*, pp. 166–167. On the same subject, see also T. Hochstrasser (The Claims of Conscience . . ., pp. 15–16) who recognised in Barbeyrac's work a conciliation of Pufendorf's "voluntarism", as basis for moral obligation, and Locke's "contractualism", as basis for political obligation (see also pp. 41f. with reference to the relatively critical literature).

The perspective that Barbeyrac choose when he approached the problem of legislation imposed the demand to distinguish between legality and morality, the legal from the ethical-religious, the right of freedom conscience from the prerogatives of civil life. In making this distinction, Barbeyrac redefines the relationship between civil and natural law in accordance with the structure of his natural law doctrine. The positive law of administration bases itself upon the mandatory nature of the *lex naturalis*. Thus, civil law affects the conscience. *Ius gentium* and positive law are an expansion, an extension to the law of nature. The *lex naturalis* remains an essential premise of the civil order and constitutes the true measure for it. In order to make up for the separation between human nature and *lex*, the political institutions must restore and reproduce natural norms, which guarantee their existence. The attribution of *imperium* together with the *pactum subiectionis* occurs only if certain conditions are given: they require that the sovereign respects certain inviolable rights, whose violation would lead to an immediate dismissal. Tyrannical governments are based on an arbitrary and not on a political rule, because they promote an explicit violation of the *ius naturale*. Natural rights are the guaranteed limits within which the positive law can operate; they are the legal conditions under which the duty of obedience of the subjects can occur. Based on upon the respect of natural law, the theory of political obligation involves the rejection of the concept of the divine right of the *princeps*. Therefore, civil society holds on to the natural order. Legal conventions draw, in fact, their entire value from the principles of the *lex naturalis*, which, from a formal and material point of view, become valid in the State. The force of sanctions does not alter the sense of this original truth: "Pour ce qui est des loix naturelles qui prescrivent ou qui défendent quelque chose, le droit civil les confirme, ou doit les confirmer par son autorité, autant que le permet ou le demande le bien public".<sup>20</sup> If natural law has to rely for its realization on the *auctoritas* of civil laws, they must acknowledge in the *lex naturalis* the condition of their applicability. The observance of that *lex* becomes not only a sufficient but necessary precondition for civil human liberty. The concentration of power in the *summa potestas* does not involve the annihilation or abolition of the subjective rights. Instead, by establishing the essential juridi-

---

<sup>20</sup> Le droit, book III, chap. 1, § I, note 2 (t. II, p. 430).

cal conditions, it provides a sphere for individual conscience. The duty to obey to external civil law does not interfere with internal human liberty. The rights of conscience form a limit to the execution of sovereignty, which constitutes a necessary condition for the protection from possible abuses by the *princeps*. The defence of the *ius naturale* is secured by the right to apply, in extreme cases, one's own conscience as a final judgement. The subject, however, should not be satisfied with an internal "resistance" only, because one is able to openly express the discontent. From the affirmation of the individual right of freedom of conscience follows the recognition of the *ius resistendi* against a sovereign who governs as tyrant and pursues his own interests recklessly, which leads to the annulment of the universal principles of natural right and morality: "On ne doit jamais obéir à ses supérieurs, au préjudice de son devoir. Bien loin de là, et à moins que d'être dans une entière impuissance de leur résister, il faut montrer un noble courage à empêcher de toutes ses forces qu'ils n'oppriment l'innocent".<sup>21</sup> If natural law is being violated, despotic governments threaten the existence of civil virtues, thus reversing the purposes for which governments have originally been created. Strictly speaking, tyrants cease to be part of the human community, and they may not only be removed but also violently annihilated. From this point of view, the right to resist appears as a necessary condition for the defence of community, which has the authority to protect its own affairs. Thus, Barbeyracs' reading of Pufendorf matures in the light of Locke, who recommended prudence and moderation when making use of the right to resist. In his commentary to *De iure naturae et gentium*, Barbeyrac quoted from Locke's famous theses in his *Second Treatise of Government* (1698, XVIII, §§ 208–210), which oppose to the vile mob, to the undifferentiated one, a small group of righteous, the most reasonable part of the subjects, which alone is fit to define itself as *people* and to promote a legitimate rebellion against tyranny: "Quand on parle d'un tyran, qui peut légitimement être déposé par le peuple, on n'entend pas par le mot de *peuple* la vile populace ou la canaille du pays, ni une cabale d'un petit nombre de séditieux; mais la plus grande et la plus saine partie des sujets (. . .). De plus, il faut que la tyrannie soit notoire et de la dernière évidence, en sorte que personne n'en puisse

---

<sup>21</sup> Le droit, § VI, note 4 (t. II, p. 441).

plus douter".<sup>22</sup> This is a moderate position, modelled on the ideals of the contemporary merchant classes, on the values of liberty and conscience, in opposition to the theological dogmatism as well as to monarchic absolutism and the neo-feudal structures, which had found support in this form of government.

The critical use of Locke that provided the corrections of and served as a supplementation to Pufendorf's theory, goes back to arguments of religious and civil ethics that are to be understood in the light of Barbeyrac's biography as an exiled Huguenot. He has, in fact, always in mind the religiously motivated justification, which initially the monarchomachs and then the Huguenots had associated with the *ius resistendi*, referring to the rights of conscience of the subjects against the privileges of a despotic and intolerant sovereignty. However, Barbeyrac deviated from leaders of the Huguenot party—such as Jean Claude and Pierre Jurieu—, through his intention to re-examine the problem of freedom of conscience in the light of natural law. If connected with the *ius naturae*, the notion of conscience loses its religious character as a private place of divine, as Jurieu had described in his *Des Droits des deux souverains en matière de religion, la conscience et le prince* (1687).<sup>23</sup> The definition of the right to resist leads Barbeyrac to question traditional dogmatic theology. Already

---

<sup>22</sup> Le droit, book VII, chap. 8, § VI, note 1 (t. II, p. 404). Locke's influences on the right of resisting in Barbeyrac has been emphasized by R. Derathé (*Jean-Jacques Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*. Paris: J. Vrin 21974). This reading, nevertheless, confirms Barbeyrac's traditional image (he made only little impact on the theoretical and political level) as an "eclectic" thinker, who supported alternative theories of popular sovereignty and absolutism (see p. 91, note). On Barbeyrac "en politique (. . .) disciple de Locke" and critic of Pufendorf's absolutism, see Jean Ehrard: *L'idée de nature en France dans la première moitié du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N. 1963, t. I, p. 344 (but see also t. II, p. 486 and note 491 and note 500 and note 527). For an up-to-date information see J. Scott: *The Law of War: Grotius, Sidney, Locke, and the Political Theory of Rebellion*, in *The Exchange of Ideas. Religion, Scholarship and Art in Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by S. Groenveld and M. Wintle. Zutphen: Uitgeversmaatschappij Walburg Pers 1994, pp. 115–132. On the "right to resist" see the contributions in *La politica dei monarcomachi*, in: *Rivista di storia della filosofia* L (1995), 3 (esp. that of J.-F. Spitz: *Locke e i monarcomachi. Problemi storiografici sul diritto di resistenza*, pp. 557–574).

<sup>23</sup> See M. Turchetti: *La liberté de conscience et l'autorité du magistrat au lendemain de la Révocation. Aperçus du débat touchant la théologie morale et la philosophie politique des réformés: Pierre Bayle, Noël Aubert de Vers, Pierre Jurieu, Jacques Philipot et Elie Saurin*, in *La liberté de conscience (XVI<sup>e</sup>–XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Actes du Colloque de Mulhouse et Bâle (1989), réunis par H. R. Guggisberg, F. Lestringant et J.-C. Margolin. Genève: Droz 1991, pp. 317–319.

in his *Préface* to Pufendorf, a violent denouncement of the “Ministres publics de la religion”, “des Pères de l’Église” and “des ecclésiastiques et théologiens protestants”, which were all responsible for having subjected “moral thinking” to the power of an intolerant ethical-religious model, appeared. Barbeyrac contrasted this ethical-religious model with the modern natural law doctrine, which attempted to emancipate natural law from the guardianship of theological dogmatism and to develop a legal awareness in the context of an autonomous system of knowledge. In this respect, he praised Grotius who had broken the ice and started a methodical study of law, offering, for the first time, a systematic *ius naturale* as well as Pufendorf for having abandoned the language and the hairsplitting of the scholastics, from which already Grotius had purged his work. In fact, Pufendorf had managed to undermine the tyrannical yoke “d’une si pernicieuse coûtume” and to follow with courage the tracks of his great predecessor, conquering “une réputation immortelle”. Taking the negative response of the Roman inquisition and of Swedish and German Protestant theologians towards the writings of the two masters into consideration, Barbeyrac concluded with the warning that “la morale ainsi négligée et presque bannie du monde par les ministres publics de la religion, s’est réfugiée chez les laïques”.<sup>24</sup>

The same *Préface* to the *De iure naturae et gentium* shows that the purpose of the translation was not only technical-professional in nature, serving the juridical education of young people destined for employment in church and government. On the contrary, its priority lays in the attempt to instil in “les gens sans lettres, ou les gens du commun”, ignorant to the extent that the expression natural law was “aussi inconnu, que les terres australes”, an awareness of the principles of morals, jurisprudence and politics.<sup>25</sup> With regards to such an awareness, Barbeyrac declared that he agreed with the theses of his friend Le Clerc, which he quoted and commented on, making an explicit reference to the *Parrhasiana* (t. II, 1701) and, particularly, to the *Pensées sur la nécessité et sur la manière d’étudier, pour les personnes qui ne font pas profession de lettres*. Grotius’s and Pufendorf’s translator shared with Le Clerc a confidence in the human ability

<sup>24</sup> Le droit, Préface du traducteur, §§ VI, IX, XI, XXIX, XXX, XII (t. I, pp. XXII–XXV, XXVII–XXXVII, LIII–LVI, CIV, CVI–CVII, LVI).

<sup>25</sup> Le droit, Préface du traducteur, § XXXII (t. I, pp. CXII–CXIII).

of education, which appears in the context of the principles of morals, politics and theology, established in a Lockean way through experience and reflection.<sup>26</sup> In order to confirm that a man can never transfer arbitrary power over his life, of which he himself is not himself his own master, onto others, Barbeyrac's main source, of course, was the *Second Treatise* (IV, 23), which quoted in a footnote to Pufendorf's *De iure* and in the *Traité de la morale des Pères* (1728).<sup>27</sup> In the first decades of the eighteenth-century, which was an age of regained political equilibrium, religions and different constellations coexisted then peacefully. Every aspect of intolerant despotic power and universal monarchy was questioned. Universal monarchy, as it was practiced by Louis XIV in France, was weakened at the beginning of the "Enlightenment" by the claims of the right of conscience, which became the main characteristic of the new concept of tolerance. Tolerance becomes a deliberately created boundary to intrusive government action and to dogmatic-ecclesiastical organizations, which serves to maintain their mutual independence.

All of this suggests that Barbeyrac's point of view and the dominant feature of his thinking is juridical and not theological in nature. The goal of his *Traité de la morale des Pères* (1728) was to emancipate jurisprudence from faith, that is to stimulate secularization of political authority, and of civil life, in general. Unlike the traditional concept of "freedom of religion", the idea of freedom of conscience makes more choices possible. It helps to determine the position and destiny of Man in *this* world, to establish the scope of action, which God and human rational nature have assigned to him. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction lost its guardianship over right of freedom of conscience completely. The idea of this freedom appears in political-juridical

---

<sup>26</sup> Parrhasiana ou Pensées diverses sur des matières de critique, d'histoire, de morale et de politique par Theodore Parrhase, Amsterdam, chez H. Schelte, 1701, t. II, pp. 91, 94.

<sup>27</sup> *Traité de la morale des Pères de l'Église: où en défendant un article de la Préface sur Pufendorf, contre l'Apologie de la morale des Pères du P. Ceillier, religieux bénédictin de la Congrégation de St. Vanne et de St. Hydulphe, on fait diverses réflexions sur plusieurs matières importantes, par Jean Barbeyrac (...)*, Amsterdam, chez P. de Coup, 1728, chap. 12, § XXIX, p. 180. See *Le droit*, book VII, chap. 8, § VI, note 2 (t. II, p. 406). On Barbeyrac and Locke with regard to this *Traité*, see the useful information offered by S. Mastellone: *Introduzione a J. Locke, Du gouvernement civil traduit de l'anglais*. Florence: Centro Editoriale Toscano 1988, pp. XIII–XIV.

life as a problem of civil community, which then, with all its powers and limitations, was in the hands of the laity. The era of religious warfare was over. The old order of dogmas and political-confessional formulas had collapsed, and arrived had the age of modern reason, of secular spirit and liberty.

(Translated from the Italian by Ulrich Groetsch and Martin Mulsow)

This page intentionally left blank



IV

DISSEMINATION AND POPULARISATION

This page intentionally left blank

DER *REFUGE* UND DER JOURNALISMUS UM 1700:  
GABRIEL D'ARTIS (CA. 1650–CA. 1730)

Herbert Jaumann

Die periodische Presse des *Refuge*, vor allem die Gazetten (Zeitungen) und die mehr oder weniger gelehrten Journale sowie die Tätigkeit einiger Autoren des *Refuge* als Zeitungsschreiber, als *gazettiers*, und als Journalisten zählen schon immer zu den spektakulärsten Erscheinungen des *Refuge*, auf die man als Kultur- und Literaturwissenschaftler zuerst aufmerksam wird, wenn man mit dieser historischen Bewegung in Berührung kommt. Dennoch kann man nicht sagen, daß diese Phänomene in der Breite ihrer Ausprägungen und der Fülle ihrer Aspekte besonders gut erforscht wären, jedenfalls kann man das bei der Durchsicht der Forschung der letzten zwei bis drei Jahrzehnte nicht feststellen. Hier überwiegen nach meinem Eindruck ziemlich eindeutig die ideengeschichtlichen Aspekte, vor allem Theologie und Politik, stärker beachtet werden in letzter Zeit auch Aspekte der Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Es sind immer wieder die gleichen wenigen Namen: der große Meister Bayle, Jean Le Clerc, Desmaizeaux, Marchand, aber selbst über Henri Basnage de Beauval hat Jean Sgard in der 1. Auflage seines *Dictionnaire*<sup>1</sup> nur ganze 5 Zeilen; und immer wieder der Hinweis auf die Vermittlungsleistungen und die Internationalität. John Christian Laursens Liste mit den Desideraten in der Einleitung zu den *New Essays*<sup>2</sup> (1995) enthält mit vollem Recht Stichworte wie die politisch-ideologischen Konzepte der Journale sowie die Rezeptionsgeschichte dieses ganzen Journalismus. Besonders zutreffend scheint mir Laursens Hinweis auf den Nutzen, den monographische Studien über charakteristische Autoren haben könnten—aber, so ist mit Laursen zu betonen, eben nicht immer nur über die großen Namen, deren Bedeutung geklärt ist, sondern auch über solche der zweiten Reihe und der dezentralen aus den Randbezirken des Geschehens wie des Interesses der Historie

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionnaire des Journalistes 1600–1789*, 2 Bde. Sous la direction de Jean Sgard. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation 1999, Art. (38) Basnage de Beauval, Henri: Bd. 1, S. 46–47.

<sup>2</sup> *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*, ed. John Christian Laursen. Leiden: Brill 1995 (*Brill's Studies in Intellectual History*, 60).

seither. Das muß nicht auf Biographismus hinauslaufen oder auf das Festhalten an dem ehrwürdigen literarhistorischen Schema von *l'homme et l'œuvre*, sondern es kann mit der Nutzung eines forschungspraktischen Vorteils begründet werden, nämlich daß sich in einzelnen Autoren signifikante Phänomene bündeln, die man andernfalls mühsam zusammentragen müßte. Vorauszusetzen ist dabei nur, daß man die richtigen auswählt, und dabei ist die Kenntnis der Rezeptionsgeschichte, der man meistens entgegensteuern muß, unverzichtbar. Es ist ja kein Zufall, daß die nach dem Modell von *l'homme et l'œuvre* gearbeiteten Studien des 19. Jahrhunderts noch heute oft zu den ergiebigsten Fundgruben gehören. Ganz im Sinne von Christian Laursen, der umfassende Studien vorschlägt über Rousset de Missy, über den Berliner Charles Ancillon, bei dem, wie es scheint, ganz besonders viele Facetten zusammenkommen oder sich bündeln lassen, oder über Jacques Bernard, den Cousin und Freund von Le Clerc, in diesem Sinne also wollte ich mich eigentlich auf einen Autor konzentrieren, der noch viel weniger namhaft ist. Ich meine *Gabriel d'Artis* (ca. 1650–ca. 1730).

D'Artis war schon 1684 einer der hugenottischen Pastoren in der Berliner Gemeinde, Jacques Abbadie hat ihn wohl in dieses Amt gebracht; dann Journalist und theologisch-konfessionspolitischer Schriftsteller und Pamphletist. Er stammt aus Millau im Rouergue, also aus der Region im Süden bzw. Südwesten, aus der auch Bayle und so viele andere kommen, aber politisch und theologisch steht er viel eher auf der Seite Jurieus, und er gebärdet sich zeitweise so orthodox und dabei so militant und freimütig, daß die einen ihm nachsagen, er sei lutherisch geworden, und andere, zweifellos die böseren und klügeren seiner Feinde, er sei ein heimlicher Jesuit oder zu den Jesuiten übergetreten. Er bleibt immer nur wenige Jahre an einem Ort, auch seiner extremen Standpunkte wegen, die schwer erträglich sein mochten, wenn auch in einem Punkt konventionell, nämlich in der Verehrung und Loyalität für die brandenburgischen und andere nichtkatholische Majestäten. Aber auch in diesem Punkt scheint er in seinem Eifer zu weit gegangen zu sein: Daß er eine Stelle in einer Widmungsvorrede des Berliner Amtsbruders Charles Ancillon an den Kurfürsten Friedrich III. öffentlich in einer Predigt rügte, scheint zu seiner Amtsenthebung um 1690 entscheidend beigetragen zu haben. Ancillon hatte formuliert: Wenn man von Trajan sagen durfte, er sein ein sterblicher Gott ('un Dieu mortel'), so gelte das für Friedrich erst recht. Was d'Artis daran genau mißfiel, das Prädikat des Göttlichen für den absoluten Monarchen, als ein Beispiel für die absolutistische

Kultisierung des Monarchen, die er immer ablehnte, oder im Gegenteil das Prädikat der Sterblichkeit des Gottes, und was an der von d'Artis geäußerten Kritik daran nun bei Hofe Anstoß erregte, darüber geben die Quellen keine eindeutige Auskunft.<sup>3</sup> Wie in vielen Fällen dieser Art könnte es die öffentliche Aufregung durch die Streitsucht der Theologen als solche gewesen sein, ganz ohne Ansehung der Frage, wer in der Sache recht hatte, die den Monarchen in allen Lagern, und vielleicht noch mehr ihren Ministern, gar nicht behagte. Ein anderer Grund für seine Amtsenthebung war zweifellos sein rigider Standpunkt in der Frage der Emigration der reformierten Pastoren mit oder auch ohne ihre Gemeinde, um sich der Verfolgung in Frankreich zu entziehen. Élie Benoît hatte die Flucht seiner Amtsbrüder verteidigt (*Histoire et apologie*, 1687), D'Artis hatte mit einer strengen und polemischen Gegenschrift geantwortet (*Sentiments des-intéressés sur la retraite*, 1688).<sup>4</sup> Danach sollten die Pastoren allenfalls als Letzte das Feld räumen. Ihre Aufgabe sei es, das Evangelium zu verkünden und nicht die eigene Haut zu retten. Dieser rigorose Standpunkt wird ihm, zusammen mit der Affäre um Ancillon und den orthodoxen Verdächtigungen seiner Berliner Kollegen, sein Amt gekostet haben. Als er es zwischen Februar 1694 und April 1696 in Amsterdam und dann in Hamburg mit einem Journal versucht, scheitert d'Artis nach drei Jahren nicht wegen seiner kämpferischen Ansichten, sondern weil er offenbar aus vielerlei Gründen gegen die Konkurrenz auf dem ziemlich diversifizierten Markt nicht bestehen kann. Bayles *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* und Basnage sind seine Vorbilder, aber im ganzen gesehen sind die holländischen Journale auch seine

<sup>3</sup> Ein Brief Bayles an Minutoli vom 21. Sept. 1693: "Il est présentement sans église, ayant eu des affaires à Berlin, où le bras séculier lui a fait avoir le dessous", und viel später ein Brief Charles Ancillons an Bayle vom 21. Febr. 1702: "... "le célèbre Mr. Dartis, qui m'a fait autrefois un si grande affaire". Zit. nach Alfred Schröcker: Gabriel d'Artis, Leibniz und das Journal de Hambourg, in: Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte 49 (1977), S. 109–129; 112. Schröcker geht auch ausführlich die vier Bände des Journal de Hambourg durch und beschreibt mehrere Artikel, Buchbesprechungen usw.

<sup>4</sup> Élie Benoît: *Histoire et apologie de la retraite des pasteurs, à cause de la persecution de France*. Frankfurt/M.: Jean Corneille 1687, S. 286; Gabriel d'Artis: *Sentimens des-intéressés sur la retraite des pasteurs de France*. Deventer: Les héritiers de Pierre Hamel 1688, S. 300; Élie Benoît: *Defense de l'apologie pour les pasteurs de France*. Frankfurt/M.: Jean Corneille 1688, S. 510 [Alles vorh. in der Staatsbibliothek Berlin: Sammelbd. Rf 7410 (a)].—Im 3. Bd. des Journal de Hambourg (1695) bespricht d'Artis später ausführlich in vier Fortsetzungen auf insgesamt 304 Seiten das mehrbändige Hauptwerk von Élie Benoît: *Histoire de l'édit de Nantes*. Delft 1693–95.

Hauptkonkurrenten. Ein anderer Grund für die Aufgabe war vielleicht, daß er 1696 in sein Berliner Predigeramt wieder eingesetzt wurde, das er aus unbekanntem Gründen aber erst im Jahre 1700 antrat. Nach publizistischen Konflikten mit seinen Amtsbrüdern Beausobre, Lenfant und Des Vignoles, die er wegen Sozinianismus angriff, wurde er um 1713 erneut seiner geistlichen Ämter in Berlin enthoben. Über seine Mitarbeit am Haager *Journal littéraire* von Prosper Marchand und Saint-Hyazinthe im Jahr von dessen Gründung (1713) ist wenig bekannt. Um die gleiche Zeit, erneut auf der Suche nach einer angemessenen Anstellung, scheint er eine Denkschrift mit dem Plan einer Reformschule vorgelegt zu haben. In der Provinz Over-Ijssel, wohl in Zwolle, wollte d'Artis ein Institut für junge *Réfugiés* gründen, speziell für den Kampf gegen Deisten und Libertins, vor allem gegen die Sozinianer, von denen er meinte, sie würden immer stärker, und die er für die Hauptfeinde des wahren reformierten Glaubens hielt. (Aber der Begriff des 'Sozinianismus' ist vor allem bei protestantischen Orthodoxen um diese Zeit fast so dehnbar wie der des 'Atheismus'). Berlin betrachtete er schon immer als eines der Zentren der Sozinianer, auch deshalb richtete er auch später immer wieder Pastoralbriefe aus dem Ausland, meist aus London, "à son troupeau", für die er sich noch immer verantwortlich fühlte, aber wohl auch, um seinen Anspruch auf das ihm von häretischen Kollegen weggenommene Amt und die damit verbundene finanzielle Versorgung zu bekräftigen. Leider war mir keines von diesen Schreiben zugänglich. Die Biographie von Gabriel d'Artis ist im ganzen, aber vor allem während seiner letzten Jahrzehnte, nicht recht überschaubar und wie gewöhnlich sind die Phasen, über die man wenig oder nichts in der Hand hat, in den älteren biographischen Artikeln<sup>5</sup> mit Gerüchten aufgefüllt. Man kennt mit Sicherheit nicht alle seine Schriften aus dieser Zeit, in der er wieder in Berlin, wo er vergeblich um die ihm zustehende Pension

---

<sup>5</sup> Einträge und Artikel u.a. bei: Johann Moller: *Cimbria litterata*, T. II (1744); Jöcher/Adelung: *Gelehrten-Lexicon*, Bd. I (1750); Erman/Reclam: *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Réfugiés françois dans les états du Roi* (1784 u.a.); Michaud: *Biographie Universelle ancienne et moderne*, Bd. II (1834); Haag: *La France protestante*, Bd. I (1. Aufl. 1846); Schröder: *Lexikon der hamburgischen Schriftsteller*, Bd. I (1851); Douen: *Les premiers pasteurs du désert* (1685–1700), Bd. I (1879); Douen: *La Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes*, 3 Bde. (1894); *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, Bd. 3 (1939); Cioranescu: *Bibliographie de la littérature française du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Bde. I, II (1965/66).—Am ausführlichsten Alfred Schröcker: *Gabriel d'Artis, Leibniz und das Journal de Hambourg*, 1977 (wie Anm. 3).

aus seiner Pastorenzeit nachsucht, und in Holland unterwegs ist, dann in Schweden, wohin eine Schwester geheiratet hat, und schließlich in England. Als Pastor bei St. James soll er 1730 in London gestorben sein.<sup>6</sup> Die Mehrzahl der dem Titel nach verzeichneten Schriften (bei Cioranescu, bei Sgard) ist heute schwer zu finden, aber es wurden offenbar auch noch keine größeren Anstrengungen unternommen, auch nicht von Sgard aus Anlaß seines Artikels.<sup>7</sup> Die vorläufig wichtigsten Quellen für die Biographie sind Briefe: allen voran der leicht zugängliche Briefwechsel mit Leibniz aus der Zeit des *Journal de Hambourg* (1695/96), der kurze Briefwechsel mit Bayle und Briefe Dritter über ihn. Von den Dokumenten aus der Berliner Zeit in den achtziger Jahren sind mir nur gelegentliche Spuren bekannt. Einzelne Texte finden sich in den wertvollen älteren Sammlungen wie denen von Emmanuel-Orentin Douen.<sup>8</sup> Nichts dagegen von den späteren Aufenthalten in Berlin, worüber es mindestens einzelne Briefe an die früheren Kollegen und briefliche Äußerungen über ihn geben muß. Auch der publizierte Streit mit Lenfant über den Berliner 'Sozinianismus' war mir nicht zugänglich (*Lettre de M. Dartis et de M. Lenfant sur les matières de socinianisme*. Berlin 1719). Leider bin ich mit meinen eigenen Bemühungen um diesen Autor und sein Werk noch nicht so weit, daß ich ihn hier in den Mittelpunkt stellen könnte. Aber was mir von d'Artis zugänglich war (gerade in Berlin ist es leider nicht viel), daraus habe ich bevorzugt einzelne Beispiele entnommen für das, was ich an Aspekten des Journalismus um 1700 behandeln will.

Nicht nur in Frankreich und den Niederlanden, auch in Deutschland trifft der journalistische Unternehmungsgeist der Hugenotten auf eine bereits bestehende, sozusagen vorstrukturierte Szene jenes neuen

---

<sup>6</sup> Seit dem späten 16. Jh. ist London immer wieder Zufluchtsort protestantischer Flüchtlinge und Häretiker verschiedener Art gewesen, auch solcher, die von der jeweiligen Orthodoxie der protestantischen Bekenntnisse verfolgt wurden. Ein berühmter Flüchtling war der Spanier Casiodoro de Reyna, ehemaliger Mönch in Sevilla und als Reformierter Anhänger Castellios, auch er von den Genfern verfolgt und seit ca. 1560 in London; zu Reyna vgl. A. Gordon Kinder: Casiodoro de Reina, Spanish Reformer of the sixteenth century. London 1975, und vor allem bei Carlos Gilly: Spanien und der Basler Buchdruck bis 1600. Basel, Frankfurt/M.: Helbing & Lichtenhahn 1985, bes. S. 353ff.—Auch Gregorio Leti, ursprünglich ein lombardischer Mönch und zeitweilig Protestant, und der Arminianer Jean Le Clerc, später der Schwiegersohn Letis, zogen sich einige Zeit nach England zurück, um sich vor der reformierten Orthodoxie in Genf bzw. in Frankreich in Sicherheit zu bringen.

<sup>7</sup> Jean Sgard: Art. (20) Artis, Gabriel d', in: Dictionnaire des Journalistes 1600–1789, Bd. I, S. 24–25 (vgl. Anm. 1).

<sup>8</sup> Vgl. Anm. 5.

Mediums, das sich in erster Linie durch *Periodizität*,<sup>9</sup> durch die periodische Organisation seines Erscheinens auszeichnet. Und ebenso klar ist, daß diese schon länger bestehende und übrigens in akutem Wandel begriffene Szene weiterbesteht und sich die gelehrten Periodica der Hugenotten daneben oder auch inmitten dieses Kontextes etablieren, der selbst in dynamischer Bewegung begriffen ist. Dieser Gattungs-Kontext ist ihre Umwelt, mit der sie einen mehr oder weniger intensiven Austausch pflegen. In jedem Fall kommt es zu Wechselwirkungen, und ich vermute, die Wirkungen nach außen stärker gewesen sind als die Rückwirkung der journalistischen Umwelt auf die Journale der Reformierten, man denke etwa an die Etablierung und den katholischen Kurs der *Mémoires de Trévoux*, deren Gründung 1701 natürlich in erster Linie im Gegenzug gegen das *Journal des Savants* erfolgt, aber in seiner konfessionellen Ausrichtung auch eine Antwort auf die Journale der Reformierten darstellt. Das gilt auch für die wenig später (1703) beginnenden, ebenso erfolgreichen *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses* der Jesuiten. Deshalb liegt es nahe, daß ich mit meinen Überlegungen genau bei diesen Relationen ansetze und von der Frage ausgehe: Was charakterisiert auf der einen Seite den gewöhnlichen Journalismus etwa um 1680/90, und was sind andererseits die typischen Merkmale des Journalismus der reformierten Gelehrten, die wenig später mit ihren Zeitschriften auf dem Markt erscheinen, in den Niederlanden, in Deutschland, in England? Es geht also um diejenige Spezifik, die ich im Vergleich mit der nicht-hugenottischen Presse gewinnen will. Ich will mich dabei auf drei der am nächsten liegenden Aspekte beschränken und versuchen, jeweils auch und gerade bei den einfachen Begriffen und Benennungen anzusetzen, nicht nur wegen meines großen Interesses an Begriffsgeschichte, sondern weil man an Begriffsgeschichte, d.h. an der so weit wie möglich getriebenen Historisierung unserer Bezeichnungen, interessiert sein muß, um über ein so entferntes Thema überhaupt in historisch einigermaßen angemessenen Begriffen reden zu können. Es geht also zuerst um Aspekte des gewöhnlichen Journalismus, (1.) um

---

<sup>9</sup> Dazu ausführlich Herbert Jaumann: *Critica. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Literaturkritik zwischen Quintilian und Thomasius*. Leiden: Brill 1995 (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 62), bes. S. 264ff., und demnächst ders.: *Historia literaria und Formen gelehrter Sammlungen, diesseits und jenseits von Periodizität*, in: *Historia literaria. Studien zum kulturellen Gedächtnis der Frühen Neuzeit*, hg. v. Frank Grunert, Friedrich Vollhardt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (ersch. 2003).



die Journalisten, (2.) um die Journale, und dann (3.) um den Journalismus der Reformierten, mit Überlegungen zu den die Reformierten betreffenden Besonderheiten.

### 1. *Die Journalisten*

Zumindest in Deutschland versteht man um diese Zeit und noch länger im 18. Jahrhundert unter *Journalist* in der Regel den Autor, Redakteur oder Herausgeber von Journalen, eben den Journalschreiber. *Journalist* ist nicht wie heute der Sammelbegriff für alle in der aktuellen Medienberichterstattung beschäftigten Publizisten. Um 1700 ist der *Journalist* ein Gelehrter, der zeitweise hauptsächlich oder nebenher vom Journalschreiben zu leben versucht. Zwischen dem Herausgeber, dem Direktor bzw. Redakteur und dem Autor eines Journals ist im Prinzip schwer zu unterscheiden, es gibt keine klar definierten Tätigkeits- oder gar Berufsrollen, so wie um diese Zeit noch zwischen dem Verleger und dem Buchdrucker und in der Provinz manchmal auch noch dem Buchhändler (bzw. 'Buchführer') oft keine oder fließende Grenzen bestehen. Das Ein-Mann-Journal, das Bayle seit März 1684 mit seinen *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* herausbringt, ist zwar in vieler Hinsicht ein ebenso singulärer Fall wie die *Monatsgespräche* von Christian Thomasius 1688/90, aber viele der frühen Journale scheinen doch zu großen Teilen von den als Direktoren genannten (oder nicht genannten) Autoren selbst verfaßt zu werden; hinzu kommt der eine oder andere eingesandte Beitrag (z.B. ein Brief, ein Extrakt über ein Buch) und hinzu kommen natürlich die Mitteilungen von Freunden und anderen Briefpartnern sowie (nicht zu vergessen) die Lektüre anderer Journale, die oft seitenweise ausgeschrieben werden. Begriff und Vorstellung von der Arbeit einer regelrechten 'Redaktion' sind für diese Zeit anachronistisch. Auch um 1700 spielen die Herausbergesellschaften (*sociétés de gens de lettres*) im Hintergrund eine bedeutende Rolle, während die praktische Informationsbeschaffung von einem mehr oder weniger festen Kreis sogenannter *Kollektoren* abhängt, die von der Sozietät geworben und rekrutiert werden und wohl auch zum Teil mit deren Mitgliedern identisch sind. Ihre Tätigkeit sichert vor allem die regelmäßige und zuverlässige Versorgung mit Buchexemplaren und Nachrichten, auch mit Gerüchten und Klatsch, je nach dem Profil, an dem sich das Journal bei der Selektion der

Nachrichten und Bücher in etwa ausrichtet. Das Bestehen und dauerhafte Funktionieren solcher Sozietäten und Kollektorenkreise ist, neben dem Interesse und dem Geld des Verlegers und dem Erfolg beim Publikum, die mit entscheidende Voraussetzung auf der Produktionsseite für das Überleben eines Journals. Als die wichtigsten Typen solcher Sozietäten im Hintergrund kann man drei nennen: (1) Die staatliche oder halbstaatliche Regie (am frühesten, am reinsten und erfolgreichsten beim *Journal des Savants* seit 1665, annähernd 'staatlich' auch bei den *Philosophical Transactions* 1665ff. der Londoner Royal Society). (2) Die akademische gelehrte Sozietät (am dauerhaft erfolgreichsten im Falle der *Acta Eruditorum*: das Leipziger *Collegium Gellianum* sowie die äußerst weitläufigen, europaweiten Verbindungen mit einem Kreis meist akademischer Gelehrter als Kollektoren; als ein kleines Beispiel: Thomasius veranlaßt den jüngeren Leipziger juristischen Kollegen Jakob von Ryssel 1689 dazu, die *Monatsgespräche* fortzusetzen). (3) Die 'professionelle' Gruppe von Journalisten als Mitunternehmer oder Mitarbeiter unmittelbar im Dienste des Verlegers, also in direkter Marktabhängigkeit (was z.B. bei vielen der größeren reformierten Journale der Fall gewesen ist). Über die Rolle des Verlegers oder Drucker-Verlegers in einem solchen Journalunternehmen ist generell viel zu wenig bekannt. Er ist in manchen Fällen Mitautor, er erwartet zusätzlichen Gewinn von dem Unternehmen, und er bedient sich in aller Regel des Journals zur Werbung für sein Verlagsprogramm (Listen von Verlagsneuerscheinungen werden regelmäßig in das Journal eingefügt, Bücher aus dem eigenen Programm werden bevorzugt besprochen usw.). Die Besprechungsexemplare bezieht der Journalist von seinem Verlag, der ihm auch bei der Beschaffung von Büchern aus anderen Verlagen behilflich ist. Daß der Bezug solcher Buchexemplare für die Rezension anders als heute nicht gratis gewesen ist, bezeugen z.B. die erhaltenen Rechnungen, die der Verleger Weidmann dem Autor und Rezensenten Thomasius gestellt hat für die Bücher, die dieser in den *Monatsgesprächen* rezensierte.

Doch zurück zur Bezeichnung 'Journalist'. Ein Begriff mit einem nur annähernd so weiten Bedeutungsumfang wie die heutigen Bezeichnungen 'Journalist' und 'Journalismus' steht um 1700 noch längst nicht zur Verfügung, vermutlich sind beide Begriffe in der uns geläufigen Bedeutung wie so vieles in dieser Begriffswelt ein Produkt frühestens der Zeit um 1800. Den Zeitungsschreiber nennt man gewöhnlich *gazettier*, auch von seiten des Journalisten meist mit

Verachtung.<sup>10</sup> Auf das weite Feld des Zeitungsjournalismus, der bekanntlich ein gutes halbes Jahrhundert älter ist als derjenige der gelehrten Journale und der Journalisten, will ich hier nicht weiter eingehen. Der Journalist jedenfalls ist das Ergebnis einer Rollenfiliation, der Ausgliederung und Ausdifferenzierung einer neuen Rolle im Konzept des *Gelehrten*, so wie dies auch für den modernen *Kritiker* zutrifft, aber einer neuen Rolle im Konzept des Gelehrten neuen Typs, des *érudit mondain*.<sup>11</sup> Die Debatten darüber laufen vor allem in Frankreich im 17. Jahrhundert, wohl auch zuvor schon in Italien, und auch hier gibt es eine *Querelle des anciens et des modernes* wie in anderen kulturellen Bereichen; denn dieser Vorzugsdiskurs, der im 17. Jahrhundert immer 'querelle' genannt wird und zuvor in lateinischen Termini tausend Jahre lange anders hieß, ist die Kulturtheorie bis in die späte Frühe Neuzeit (um 1800) gewesen, in deren Rahmen und mit deren Kategorien die Bewertung von Texten, Konzepten, Autoren immer schon nach Maßgabe eines Zeit-Index ausgehandelt wurde.<sup>12</sup> Der Journalist in dieser spezifisch engen Bedeutung des Begriffs in der frühen Neuzeit ist demnach also eine Rollenmöglichkeit des modernen Gelehrten, wobei die dieser Rolle entsprechende Praxis selbst, nämlich auf eher populäre Weise gelehrte Gegenstände bzw. Inhalte ernsthafter Bücher zu vermitteln für ein Publikum, das breiter ist als das der zünftigen Gelehrten, in Italien und Frankreich sehr viel früher eingespielt ist als das Tätigkeitsfeld, das das periodische Journal bietet. Diese Praxis und den dazugehörigen Typus des Autors gibt es früher, als sich das Journal etabliert, man denke z.B. an einen so außerordentlich erfolgreichen Schriftsteller wie Pietro Aretino (gest. 1556), der immer wieder auch als eine Art Protojournalist bezeichnet wurde. D.h. auch, daß die Statuskonkurrenten des Journalisten nicht die *gazettiers*, sondern vielmehr andere Gelehrte sind, an Universitäten, in Ämtern des Hofes, der Kirche, der Stadt. Der *gazettier* hat möglicherweise studiert, aber im Dienste der Zeitung übt er kein gelehrtes

<sup>10</sup> Vgl. z.B. Pieter Burmans böse Polemik gegen den 'Journalisten' Le Clerc nicht zuletzt mit Hilfe dieser den Zeitungsschreiber bezeichnenden Kategorie: 'Le gazetier menteur, ou Mr. Le Clerc convaincu de mensonge & calomnie'. Utrecht 1710.

<sup>11</sup> Dazu Herbert Jaumann: *Critica* (wie Anm. 9), bes. Kap. IV.

<sup>12</sup> Dazu Herbert Jaumann: *Critica* (wie Anm. 9), bes. S. 90ff., und ders.: Der alt/neu-Diskurs (*Querelle*) als kulturelles Orientierungsschema: Charles Perrault und Christian Thomasius, in: *Kulturelle Orientierung um 1700.*, hg. v. Sylvia Heudecker, Dirk Niefanger, Jörg Wesche. Tübingen: Niemeyer (ersch. ca. 2003).

Metier aus und kann beim besten Willen keiner Disziplin zugerechnet werden. Er ist aus dem Horizont der Gelehrtenrolle sozusagen ausgetreten. Aber wer für Journale schreibt, agiert noch immer in einer Gelehrtenrolle, sehr ähnlich etwa dem Autor der *Historia litteraria*, eines neuartigen Feldes in den Grenzen der alten, noch lange gültigen *Ars grammatica*. Mit den Aufgaben der *Historia litteraria* werden die lateinisch *Diaria* oder *Ephemerides litterariae* genannten Zeitschriften in dieser frühen Zeit gerne in Verbindung gebracht, so problematisch oder verächtlich diese Tätigkeit anderen Gelehrten, zumal den gelehrten *anciens* und den wohlbestallten Amtsträgern auch erscheinen mochte. Die einschlägige Debatte auch über die Statusfragen des Journalisten findet man meines Wissens nirgends so konzentriert wie gerade in Deutschland, und zwar um das Jahr 1715, als eine ganze Reihe von Traktaten zu diesen Fragen erscheint, teils separat, teils ihrerseits wiederum in Journalen gedruckt. Analog zu der viel bekannteren und auch modern edierten sogenannten 'Zeitungsdebatte' in der Mitte des 17. Jhs. könnte man sie 'Journal-Debatte' nennen. Auch die meines Wissens früheste nennenswerte Bibliographie der Journale in Europa, Christian Junckers *Schediasma historicum de Ephemeridibus sive Diariis Eruditorum*, ist in Deutschland erschienen, 1692 in Leipzig bei Gleditsch.<sup>13</sup> Wenn man beobachtet, wie ein so sehr von der Semantik des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts bestimmter Begriff wie der des 'Intellektuellen' ohne viel Überlegung auf Bayle oder auf Erasmus oder von LeGoff gar auf Abälard und das Mittelalter zurückprojiziert wird, dann kann man die Diskussion um den historisch korrekten Gebrauch selbst der simpelsten Grundbegriffe gar nicht wichtig genug nehmen.

Die hier angesprochene Frage der Ausdifferenzierung der Gelehrtenrolle(n) führt auf die nach deren Veranlassung. Warum die Filiations-

---

<sup>13</sup> Davor meines Wissens nur ein Kapitel in Valentin Heinrich Vogler: *Introductio universalis in notitiam cuiusque generis bonorum scriptorum*. Helmstedt 1670. Eine der frühesten problemorientierten Kompendien vom Typus der *Historia critica*, die ein bibliographisches Verzeichnis mit Ausführungen zu Autoren und Problemen der Gattung verbindet, ist meines Wissens Denis-François Camusat: *Histoire critique des journaux*, 2 Bde. Paris 1734, von seinem früheren Mitarbeiter Jean-Frédéric Bernard postum herausgegeben. Adrien Baillets *Jugements des Savants sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs*, 1685/86 zuerst erschienen, enthalten zwar noch keine speziellen Aussagen über den Journalisten, doch über den Kritiker neuen Typs sehr wohl. Sie sind ein äußerst ergiebiges Dokument zur Klärung von Fragen der alten und neuen Gelehrtenrollen und werden viel zu wenig herangezogen, weshalb ich sie hier mit Nachdruck erwähnen wollte (vgl. den Reprint der 8-bändigen Ausgabe von 1725, 1971 bei Olms mit einer Einleitung von Yvon Belaval erschienen).

prozesse am Rollenkomplex des Gelehrten, woher kommen die Journalisten, oder konkret gefragt: Was bringt Gelehrte dazu, eine Zeitlang diese neuartige Tätigkeit auszuüben bzw. diese Tätigkeit zu einem Teil ihrer Arbeit zu machen, neben anderem? Denn ein lebenslanger fulltime-Beruf ist sie wie auch die des literarischen Autors und des Dichters in den seltensten Fällen. Eine sozialgeschichtliche und wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Antwort ist die im ausgehenden 17. Jahrhundert einsetzende und im 18. Jahrhundert anhaltende Überfüllungskrise in den Universitäten, mit einer Vielzahl von Bedingungen und Konsequenzen wie eben derjenigen eines zunehmenden Mißverhältnisses zwischen akademischem output und alten und neuen Möglichkeiten der Anstellung in den üblichen Berufsfeldern. Die Gründung eines Journals bzw. die Arbeit für ein Journal ist ein neuartiger Ausweg, neben dem Mitarbeiter, z.B. dem Korrektor in Verlag oder Druckerei schon im 15. Jahrhundert, dem Hofmeister und Reisebegleiter junger Adliger usw., ein typischer Übergangsbberuf in einer Zeit, als das Aufrücken in eines der traditionellen Gelehrtenämter wieder unsicherer als ohnehin geworden war. Das hatte neben der angespannten Nachfrage aufgrund der zunehmenden Bewerberzahlen mit vielen Faktoren zu tun, aktuell auftretenden wie langfristig wirksamen: mit Statusveränderungen auf der Seite der Ämter selbst sowie auch mit dem Ansehen oder 'Image' der gelehrten Disziplinen, mit der langen Geschichte der Positivierung von *curiositas* und der auch damit einhergehenden steigenden Bedeutung von Publizität und Öffentlichkeit und der Verbreiterung der Palette legitimer gelehrter Gegenstände, mit der Attraktivität des Kommunikationsmodells *République des Lettres* usw., vor allem aber immer wieder mit den Veränderungen in den Gelehrtenrollen, die mit alledem zu tun haben. Ein Stichwort ist die *Pedantismus-Debatte*, die sich durch die ganze Epoche des Humanismus (auch im *Ciceronianus* des Erasmus) und Späthumanismus zieht und gegen 1700 erneut sehr akut wird. In diesem Diskurs, der im übrigen gerade auch in den Zeitschriften und speziell in der Debatte über deren Funktion und Wert geführt wird, schlagen sich die meisten der relevanten Faktoren dieses Strukturwandels nieder und lassen sich deshalb dort gut studieren.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Vgl. zur Pedantismus-Debatte Wilhelm Kühlmann: *Gelehrtenrepublik und Fürstenstaat*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1983.

## 2. Die *Journalle*

In der Frühzeit der *Journalle*, also vor der Ausbreitung der *Moralischen Wochenschriften* seit ca. 1720, scheint mir die Gattungsfrage das zentrale und interessanteste Problem einer den Bestand nicht nur sichtenden, sondern auch medienhistorisch interpretierenden und klassifizierenden Forschung zu sein. Statt die katastrophale Lage der Forschung auf diesem Gebiet besonders in Deutschland zu beklagen,<sup>15</sup> hier ein paar charakteristische Aspekte. Faszinierend an der Situation des letzten Drittels des 17. Jahrhunderts ist ihr 'experimenteller' Charakter. Da wird in immer neuen Ansätzen der Versuch gemacht, unterschiedliche Varianten einer periodischen Publikationsform auf eine gewisse Dauer zu etablieren. Diese Varianten sind ja im Haushalt der gelehrten Publikationsgenres nicht vorgesehen, sie müssen sozusagen zwischen die seit Jahrhunderten bestehenden Gattungen hineingezwängt werden. Dabei greift man selbstverständlich auf die bewährten Genres bzw. deren Komponenten zurück, integriert und bündelt sie aber mehr oder weniger neu für die Bedürfnisse der periodisch organisierten Erscheinungsweise, mit zum Teil neuartigen Inhalten für ein zum Teil in Herkunft, Interessen und Bedürfnissen anders ausgerichtetes Publikum bzw. auch für ein altes Publikum, das neue Bedürfnisse entwickelt bzw. das man dazu gebracht hat. Und man hat lange Zeit keineswegs ein festes, normatives Konzept des 'Journal', der 'Zeitschrift' im Sinn. Deshalb hat die Klassifikation der Texte nach den Kategorien etwa der sog. Zeitungswissenschaft/Publizistik vor allem in Deutschland zu grotesk anachronistischen, d.h. die semantische Perspektive, aus der heraus diese Experimente angestellt wurden, verfehlenden Ergebnissen geführt, die man zuerst aus dem Weg räumen muß, ehe man sich dieser Situation analytisch nähert. Ein Beispiel, speziell in Deutschland, sind die zahlreichen Versuche mit dialogischen Formen, auch hier

---

<sup>15</sup> Kirchners Bibliographie der Zeitschriften des deutschen Sprachgebietes bis 1900. Stuttgart 1969 erschienen auf der Datenbasis der 30er Jahre, also vor den Kriegsverlusten besonders der Periodica der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, ist vor allem in den Kategorien, mit denen die *Journalle* benannt und klassifiziert werden, einfach grotesk, wenn z.B. um 1700 von "literaturwissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften" die Rede ist. Man vergleiche dagegen vorbildlich Hatin: *Bibliographie historique et critique de la presse périodique française*. Paris 1866, und jetzt vor allem Sgard: *Bibliographie de la presse classique (1600–1789)*. Genève: Slatkine 1984 (mit zahlreichen Titeln französischer Periodica vor 1665, dem Jahr der Gründung des *Journal des Savants*!), und ders.: *Dictionnaire des Journaux 1600–1789* (wie Anm. 1) usw. Zur Kritik vgl. Herbert Jaumann: *Critica* (wie Anm. 9), bes. S. 274ff.

im Ausgang von traditionellen Mustern, etwa des humanistischen Lehr- und Unterhaltungsdialogs, des satirische Dialogs, des Gattungssyndroms des Lukianismus, Boccalinis *Ragguagli* usw.,<sup>16</sup> die dann bald nach 1700 auch in Deutschland ersichtlich aufgegeben werden. Der Begriff des Journals ist also Jahrzehnte lang gekennzeichnet durch fließende Konturen, durch Labilität oder auch experimentelle Flexibilität, und er ist deshalb und weil er inmitten einer ganzen Palette alter Gattungsäquivalente auch um seine Etablierung ringt, auch keineswegs ohne Alternative. D.h., es gibt auf dem Niveau der periodisch organisierten gelehrten Presse eine Reihe von Äquivalenten, die ja auch eine Vielzahl verschiedener Namen tragen, deren Bedeutung man nicht unterschätzen sollte und die ganz verschiedene Gestaltungs- und Wirkungsimplicationen signalisieren, darunter häufig auch solche, die sich genau genommen mit dem Prinzip der Periodizität, nämlich der Sukzession (gegenüber dem älteren Prinzip der Thesaurierung),<sup>17</sup> gar nicht vertragen, was wiederum den suchenden Charakter dieser Phase der Gattungskonstitution nur unterstreicht, in der man für neue Intentionen, für die die angemessenen Formen mit dem überdies nötigen Ansehen nicht immer zur Verfügung stehen, auf Altes zurückgreifen muß: *Courrier, Mercure, Mémoires, Messenger, Feuilles, Pièces, Affiches, Avis, Discours, Bagatelles, Nouvelles, Lettres, Dialogues, Entretiens, Histoire, Recueil, Bibliotheca, Acta, Gedanken, Fragen* usw. Von der großen Bedeutung der Sozietäten und festen Kollektoren für eine relativ kleine Zahl der gelehrten Periodica vom Typ der Leipziger *Acta Eruditorum* war die Rede. Aber unterhalb dieser komfortablen und überlebensstarken Organisationsform, die der junge Gelehrte außerhalb der Universität, der sich von einem Verleger anheuern läßt, nur aus der Ferne beneiden kann, kommt es zu unzähligen Einzelunternehmen, die wenige Wochen oder Monate und höchstens ein paar Jahre überleben, auch mit häufiger Fluktuation der Autoren und Direktoren und meist unzuverlässigen oder fehlenden Informanten, die das periodische Füllen der Seiten einer Lieferung, wöchentlich, vierzehntägig oder monatlich, zu einer quälenden Arbeit geraten lassen mußte. Periodizität bedeutete sicherlich auch eine Mühsal, nicht nur das aus der historischen

<sup>16</sup> Vgl. Herbert Jaumann: *Critica* (wie Anm. 9), S. 276ff., und ders.: Bücher und Fragen. Zur Genrespezifik der "Monatsgespräche", in: Christian Thomasius (1655–1728). Neue Forschungen im Kontext der Frühaufklärung, hg. v. Friedrich Vollhardt. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1997, S. 395–404, und ders.: Art. Totengespräch, in: *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, Bd. 3. Berlin: de Gruyter (ersch. 2002).

<sup>17</sup> Vgl. die Literaturhinweise in Anm. 9 (zur *Historia litteraria* usw.).

Distanz faszinierend scheinende Ausprobieren eines neuen Publikationsprinzips und ein qualitativer Sprung in der Mediengeschichte. Auch hier liegen Gründe vor: soziale, organisatorische, nicht den Gattungsdiskurs selbst betreffende, aber ihn mit bedingende Gründe für die Instabilität des Genres. *Sie* sollten im Zentrum der Analyse stehen und die Beschreibung der Gattung anleiten und nicht durch anachronistische Gattungsbegriffe aus viel späteren Epochen verdeckt werden. Seit dem mittleren 18. Jahrhundert ist das Terrain geklärt und geordnet, und die Praxis hat sich auf eine leicht überschaubare Zahl von stabiler gewordenen Varianten eingespielt.

### 3. *Der Journalismus der Reformierten*

In den Grundzügen trifft dies alles, jedenfalls das, was dabei für die französische Szene charakteristisch ist, mehr oder weniger auch auf die Autoren der Journale des *Refuge* zu, und aus diesem Grund scheint es mir auch eher ein Problem als eine selbstverständliche Tatsache zu sein, vom *Journalismus des Refuge* überhaupt zu sprechen. Im folgenden einige Aspekte und Materialien, die diese Vermutung teils bestätigen, teils in Frage stellen können.

(1) Sind diese Autoren wirklich Theologen, Prediger, Rechtsgelehrte des *Refuge*, wenn sie Journalisten sind? Als ein Beispiel mögen die Vorstellungen von d'Artis im *Journal de Hambourg* dienen, wie er sie in den Briefen an Leibniz benennt und rechtfertigt und wie sie aus dem leider unvollständigen Hamburger Exemplar zu entnehmen sind.

D'Artis, der schon im September 1686 eine Hamburgerin geheiratet hatte, Anne Béard aus der seit dem Beginn des Jahrhunderts dort existierenden reformierten Gemeinde,<sup>18</sup> zog im Frühjahr 1694 mit der Familie nach Hamburg und bemühte sich darum, über die Vermittlung von Leibniz sein Journal am Hof in Hannover einzuführen. Die Höfe, vor allem aber nicht nur die protestantischen, zählten zu den bevorzugten Adressaten, über die Autoren des *Refuge* Einfluß und publizistischen Erfolg zu befördern suchten. Vielleicht hatten sie dabei auch das Vorbild der Jesuiten im Auge, das ihnen aus der Heimat nur zu gut bekannt war. D'Artis versucht es mit einem Widmungsbrief

---

<sup>18</sup> Zu diesen biographischen Umständen und den Dokumenten vgl. Schröcker (Anm. 3).



an die Adresse des Kurfürsten Ernst August im 2. Band des *Journal de Hambourg* (1695), dessen Gemahlin Sophie an diesen Dingen sehr interessiert war, doch Leibniz rät ihm ab: Er solle sich lieber bemühen, den Geschmack, das *génie élevé*, der Fürstin zu treffen. ‘Elle aime les pensées rares et extra-ordinaires où il y a quelques choses de beau, de curieux et de paradoxes’.<sup>19</sup> Leibniz, der auch selbst kleinere Beiträge im *Journal des Hugenotten* drucken ließ, gibt damit in seiner manchmal ganz unbekümmerten Art die Kritik Sophies an dem *Journal* weiter. Wer die Kurfürstin auch nur über Leibniz’ jahrzehntelange Beziehung zu ihr oder als Briefpartnerin der Lieselotte von der Pfalz kennt, wird sich nicht wundern, einer versierten Nutzerin des neuen Mediums zu begegnen. D’Artis schicke ihr ein *Journal*, so hatte sie sich bei Leibniz beklagt, worin sie nur solche Dinge finde, die sie ohnehin fast alle kenne. Die Nachrichten müßten rascher und direkter kommen, etwa der Abdruck der Leichenpredigt für den Duc de Luxembourg, der am 4. Januar 1695 gestorben war, nicht erst im Heft vom 17. Juni. Leibniz verteidigte wohl d’Artis gegenüber der Fürstin. Aber dieser war enttäuscht und verärgert. Die Kurfürstin wolle sich wohl auf seine Kosten nur ein wenig unterhalten, schreibt er, während er mit unüberwindlichen Schwierigkeiten und Engpässen zu kämpfen habe: verzögerte Besprechungsexemplare, viel zu wenig Zeit zum Lesen und obendrein noch Artikel zu schreiben, und schließlich fehle das Geld. Ausführlich verteidigt er sich gegen den Vorwurf, nicht das Neueste zu bringen: Er könne es nicht, aber er wolle es auch nicht. Denn die zeitbedingten Neuigkeiten verlören innerhalb von acht Tagen ihren ganzen Reiz, während diejenigen des gelehrten Wissens doch ein wenig dauerhafter seien (‘Mais celles de littérature ont un peu plus de durée’). Er bemühe sich darum, zu den behandelten Gegenständen möglichst etwas von ihm selbst hinzuzutun, über das hinaus, was die Bücher oder andere Themen von sich aus hergäben. Nur so lasse sich allenfalls etwas wirklich Neues erzielen (‘comme je m’attache à mettre le plus souvent dans les sujets que je traite quelque chose du mien outre ce que les livres ou les autres sujets me fournissent cela peut au moins passer pour nouveau’). Die Aufgabe des Journalisten sei es nicht, nach Raritäten und Paradoxen zu suchen, sondern genau zu berichten (‘rapporter fidèlement’), einen allgemeinen Begriff von den Dingen zu geben (‘donner une idée

<sup>19</sup> Leibniz an d’Artis im Juli 1695, wie im folgenden zit. nach Schröcker (wie Anm. 3), p. 124.

generale de choses'), seine Meinung zu sagen, wo sie am Platz ist, und die Themen möglichst abwechselnd und erhellend darzustellen.<sup>20</sup> Es geht d'Artis also um Kontextualisierung der Gegenstände, nicht nur um Information, sondern um Wissen, könnte man heute sagen, und er vertritt besonders deutlich jene Tendenz der *Réfugiés*, auf den auch Haase hingewiesen hat,<sup>21</sup> vom Nachrichtenmagazin zum Forum für Diskussion und Kritik, zu einer Behandlung der Gegenstände, in der der Journalist die Gedankenführung übernimmt, kommentiert, Akzente setzt, Vergleiche zieht, Mängel und Versäumnisse, Stärken und Schwächen des betreffenden Buches markiert. Das ist kein Gegensatz zu den vom nahezu absoluten Vorbild Bayle so betonten Prinzipien der Unbefangenheit und Gerechtigkeit, weil beides, kritische Diskussion und Gerechtigkeit, sozusagen der objektiven Vernunft, an der alle teilhaben, Geltung verschafft. Noch ausgeprägter vielleicht findet man diese Richtung in Étienne Chauvins *Nouveau Journal des Savants* (1694–1698, zuerst ein Jahr lang in Rotterdam, dann seit 1695 in Berlin), dem unmittelbaren Konkurrenten von d'Artis, oder auch später in der *Bibliothèque germanique* (Amsterdam 1720ff., mit Sitz in Berlin) der Lenfant, Des Vignoles, Beausobre usw.<sup>22</sup> Anstelle der Kurfürstin in Hannover versuchte es d'Artis übrigens in diesem 2. Band seines Journals mit einer Widmung an das benachbarte Wolfenbüttel: *A Son Altesse Electorale Monseigneur L'Electeur de Brunzvic Lunebourg*, das ist um die Zeit (seit 1685) Anton Ulrich, zunächst als Mitregent seines Bruders Rudolf August, heute ein großer Dichter des höfischen Barockromans, aber auch zu seiner Zeit der angesehene Erbe der weltberühmten Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, die sein Vater, Herzog August der Jüngere, aufgebaut hatte.

(2) Die Journale des *Refuge* scheinen mir in ihren Innovationen, was die Methode der Darstellungen, das Verhältnis von Reproduktion und Kritik, von Wiedergabe der Buchinhalte und der Verarbeitung

<sup>20</sup> D'Artis an Leibniz, 9. Juli 1695, zit. nach Schröcker (wie Anm. 3), p. 125, Fn 82.

<sup>21</sup> Erich Haase: Einführung in die Literatur des Refuge. Der Beitrag der französischen Protestanten zur Entwicklung analytischer Denkformen am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot 1959.

<sup>22</sup> Dazu jetzt Sandra Pott: *Critica perennis. Zur Gattungsspezifik gelehrter Kommunikation im Umfeld der "Bibliothèque Germanique" (1720–1741): Isaac de Beausobre und Paul-Émile Maucelers Auseinandersetzung mit Johann Christoph Wolf*, in: *Die Praktiken der Gelehrsamkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit*, hg. v. Helmut Zedelmaier, Martin Mulsow. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2001, S. 249–273.

von deren Problemen, also in ihrer Thematisierungsleistung und den Risiken, die sie dafür eingehen, flexibler und erfindungsreicher als ihre Konkurrenten wenngleich, beiläufig gesagt, sicherlich mit Ausnahme des Christian Thomasius der *Monatsgespräche* von 1688/89, der von Bayle gelernt hat und, obwohl Lutheraner, dennoch theologisch in vielem den Hugenotten nahekammt; auch er wird ja kurz danach zum akademisch-politischen *Réfugié*, wenn auch nicht zum Glaubensflüchtling. Eine andere Veranlassung zu dieser Innovationsfähigkeit und Risikofreude, die mit intellektueller Programmatik nichts zu tun haben muß, diese aber zum Instrument machen kann, ist die Abhängigkeit dieses Journalismus vom Markt. Die Presse ist in dieser Zeit des 'marktfeindlichen', sozusagen 'staatswirtschaftlichen' und dirigistischen Merkantilismus nirgends völlig marktförmig organisiert, weshalb es auf gute Kontakte zu den staatlichen Autoritäten an den Höfen auch unter diesem Aspekt ankommt. Aber gerade in den viel stärker bürgerlich-kommunal organisierten Niederlanden und in England dürfte die Presse zu den Wirtschaftssektoren gehören, in denen die Marktgesetze am deutlichsten greifen, im Vergleich zu Frankreich oder gar den deutschen Territorien, wo man die holländischen Erzeugnisse weitgehend bloß als Importware kennt, mit Berlin, Halle, Frankfurt/Main, Hamburg, später zunehmend Leipzig als gelinden Ausnahmen. Auch in Versailles soll der König die informativen Gazetten und die *journaux d'Hollande* lieber gelesen haben als seine eigene, streng zensurierte Presse. Die Journale des *Refuge* konnten zumal in den frühen Jahrzehnten höchstens mit Sympathien von seiten der reformierten Glaubensgenossen oder anderer aufgeschlossener, 'curiöser' Leser rechnen, hatten aber kaum eine institutionelle Stütze in den Gastländern. So war man gerade in dieser Not auf Tugenden der Selbstorganisation, z.B. des Aufbaus eigener *sociétés de gens de lettres*, die mit der Zeit hinter den Journalen stehen, und der eifrigen Nutzung aller nur möglichen Ressourcen verwiesen. Die Aktivitäten und Briefwechsel von Gabriel d'Artis mit Leibniz, den Höfen in Hannover, Wolfenbüttel und Berlin und mit Bayle und anderen Autoren des eigenen Lagers sind dafür ein Beispiel, zumindest für die frühe Zeit der 90er Jahre. Gegen die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts und danach sieht die Lage, jedenfalls in Berlin aufgrund der Rolle des *Refuge* in der Akademie, ganz anders aus.

(3) Zu den vielfältigen Aktivitäten bei der Konkurrenz um Marktpositionen gehört auch die Bemühung um besondere Leistungen im

Angebot der Journale und damit ein Vorantreiben der Diversifizierung der Genres durch thematische Spezialisierung, während das Gros der anderen Journale, zumal in Deutschland, sich einerseits auf Raritäten, Numismatik und Klatsch, andererseits auf die risikolose Reproduktion des Inhalts von Büchern verlegt, die im übrigen immer als Service für diejenigen Gelehrten gerechtfertigt wurde, die sich die Bücher nicht kaufen könnten eines der wichtigsten Argumente in der Journal-Debatte. Deutlich ist dies in den Buchbesprechungen im *Journal de Hambourg*, die natürlich nicht alle von d'Artis stammen und unter denen, wie erwähnt, auch solche von Leibniz sind. Auch d'Artis muß sich an den neutralen Ton der Gattung des *Extracts* anpassen. Aber er ragt unübersehbar aus dem Durchschnitt hervor, und das Urteil von Jean Sgard, der über die wohl ausgedehnteste Vergleichskompetenz verfügt, ist nur leicht übertrieben: "Par sa passion militante, son ironie, son rêve de tolérance universelle, d'Artis apporte à la presse protestante un ton particulièrement véhément, qui lui fit certainement beaucoup d'ennemis."<sup>23</sup> Ein *extrait* in der *Bibliothèque germanique* kommt jedenfalls einer kritischen Rezension oder einem selbständigen Traktat nahe, während z.B. ein *Extract* im *Monatlichen Auszug* (1700–1704) aus Hannover eine langwierige Paraphrase mit seitenlangen Zitaten ist, und dabei gehört diese Zeitschrift Eccards, an der wiederum Leibniz aktiv mitgearbeitet hat, noch zu den besseren.<sup>24</sup> Ein Beispiel für die ehrgeizigen Konzepte, auf die man in den Journalen des *Refuge* stoßen kann, ist das Projekt einer systematischen Vermittlung deutscher Gelehrsamkeit, zumal des Naturrechts, das in der *Préface* zum *Journal germanique* (Band I, 1720) dargestellt und mit dessen Einlösung sofort begonnen wird, nämlich zuerst anhand einer weitläufigen Diskussion über Thomasius' *De concubinato* und der dadurch in Deutschland ausgelösten Debatte. Dieses Journal wendet sich in erster Linie an ein französisches Publikum, an ein Publikum in Frankreich, nicht etwa an das deutsche, und man versucht nicht mehr und nicht weniger, als die deutsche Gelehrtenkultur aus dem Dunkel der Unbekanntheit und der negativen Vorurteile ans Licht der aktuellen Öffentlichkeit zu bringen. Deutschland sei nicht nur nicht barbarisch, sondern als

<sup>23</sup> Jean Sgard: Art. (632) Journal d'Amsterdam, Journal de Hambourg (1694–1696), in: Dictionnaire des Journaux 1600–1789, Bd. 1. Paris 1991, S. 568–569; 569.

<sup>24</sup> Vgl. Annegret Stein-Karnbach: G. W. Leibniz und der Buchhandel, in: Archiv f. die Geschichte des Buchwesens 23 (1982), Sp. 1190–1418. Zu Eccard vgl. Herbert Jaumann: Art. Eccard, Johann Georg (von Eckardt), in: Literaturlexikon, hg. v. Walther Killy, Bd. 3 (1989), S. 163–164.

die Heimat des Buchdrucks und der Reformation geradezu die Wiege der Wissenschaften (*'la pépinière des Sciences'*). Christian Thomasius soll in diesem neu zu entdeckenden geistigen Kontinent einen der zentralen Plätze einnehmen, und wenn man bedenkt, daß Thomasius noch heute vor allem in der angloamerikanischen Forschung den Wenigsten ein Begriff und dort im Namensregister theoriegeschichtlicher Studien eine absolute Seltenheit ist, kann man die Kühnheit (und Vergeblichkeit) dieses Projekts ermessen. Lenfant und Genossen scheint um 1720 tatsächlich so etwas wie eine Umsteuerung in den Modellen der Gelehrsamkeit vorzuschweben: von Italien zu Deutschland.<sup>25</sup> Vielleicht handelt es sich bei diesem Versuch einer Reorientierung um eine Größenordnung, die nur mit den Leistungen der Madame de Staël nach der Wende zum 19. Jahrhundert zu vergleichen wäre. Daß sie diesen letzteren gegenüber völlig vernachlässigt werden konnte, liegt nicht an der historischen Schwäche dieses Reorientierungsversuchs, sondern vielmehr daran, daß es sich dabei um Orientierungen handelte, die trotz aller Zurückhaltung gerade Lenfants in der religionspolitischen Argumentation, vom reformierten Protestantismus ausgingen und sich innerhalb der alten Gelehrtenkultur bewegten. Sie konnten sich nicht auf die *'moderne'* klassisch-literarische Kultur von Weimar beziehen, die für die Staël eine romantische gewesen ist. *'Romantisch'* ist in diesem Zusammenhang, und im Einklang mit dem gemeineuropäischen Begriffsgebrauch, weit mehr als nur ein literarischer Begriff. Er bezeichnet dann auch eine Gelehrsamkeit jenseits des Zusammenbruchs der alteuropäischen Gelehrtenkultur. Der disziplinäre Ort bzw. Nicht-Ort noch dieses Tagungsthemas zeigt, daß sich noch nicht viel daran geändert hat, daß die alte Gelehrtenkultur den Universitätsdisziplinen in Deutschland Hekuba ist.

---

<sup>25</sup> Es handelt sich hier also um das Postulat einer Wirkung in umgekehrter Richtung gegenüber dem Thema des Bandes von Bois, Pierre-André, Roland Krebs und Jean Moes (Hg.): *Les lettres françaises dans les revues allemands du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle/Die französische Literatur in den deutschen Zeitschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt/M. 1997 (Convergences 4) Das frühe 18. Jahrhundert ist auch sonst eine Zeit der häufigen Modellwechsel, in den Nationalstereotypen, auch in der Literaturtheorie usw. Das Akutwerden der Modellfrage ist natürlich ein Dauerproblem im Zuge der Evolution der Nationalkulturen in der frühen Neuzeit seit dem 16. Jahrhundert, mit zeitlich, regional und in verschiedenen kulturellen Diskursen unterschiedlichen Brennpunkten.

## 4.

Es gehört sicher zu den Desideraten der Forschung über den *Refuge*, nach dem Verhältnis einzelner Autoren und der Journale zu den Ereignissen und den Standpunkten in der Pariser *Querelle* zu fragen, die sich nahezu exakt gleichzeitig mit den frühen Jahren seit 1685 abgespielt hat.<sup>26</sup> In der Akademiesitzung des 27. Januar 1687 trägt Charles Perrault sein panegyrisches Poem mit dem Titel *Le siècle de Louis le Grand* vor, aus Anlaß der Genesung des Königs von einer dieser furchtbaren Kieferoperationen, und es kommt zu der denkwürdigen Aktualisierung dieses kulturtheoretischen und latent politischen Disputs zwischen den *anciens* und den *modernes*. 1688 erscheint Fontenelles *Digression sur les anciens et les modernes*, und im gleichen Jahr beginnen die vier Bücher von Perraults fünf Dialogen unter dem Titel *Parallèle des anciens et des modernes* zu erscheinen, bis zum Jahr 1697. Charles Perrault war ein Mitarbeiter des 1683 verstorbenen Colbert, der die Gründung des *Journal des Savants* als eines wissenschaftlichen Organs in staatlicher Regie maßgeblich betrieben hatte. Haase hat diese Gleichzeitigkeit natürlich gesehen und vertritt im Einklang mit der älteren Forschung die Auffassung, die führenden Autoren des *Refuge*, Bayle, Basnage, Le Clerc, Chauvin, selbst Jurieu, hätten den Standpunkt der *modernes* vertreten. Vor allem den Journalen wird diese Einstellung immer wieder attestiert. Dafür gibt es ganz sicher zahlreiche Anhaltspunkte und Belege, wenngleich auch immer wieder Belege dagegen, z.B. in Étienne Chauvins *Nouvelle Journal des Savants*, das sich (in Bd. I, 1694) in Bezug auf die Schätzung der antiken Autoren entschieden für die *anciens* ausspricht. Aber die ganze Frage ist komplizierter und muß in mindestens die folgenden Teilfragen differenziert werden: Es kommt erstens auf die Zeit an, von der man spricht, die 80er und 90er Jahre oder später. Zweitens ist zu fragen, ob die Optionen an der Oberfläche der Debatte gemeint sind (davon gibt es im Verlauf der Debatte bekanntlich im wesentlichen drei) oder die latenten Alternativen, die an der Oberfläche nicht 1:1 gespiegelt werden? Drittens und damit eng zusammenhängend: Geht es unter dem Aspekt der Alternativen zwischen den historischen Referenzen nur um die einfache zweistellige Alternative Antike/Neuzeit oder sind auch weitere Alternativen im Spiel, etwa heidnische Antike

<sup>26</sup> Vgl. Herbert Jaumann: Der alt/neu-Diskurs ('Querelle') als kulturelles Orientierungsschema (im Erscheinen, wie Anm. 12).

vs. christliche; Frühchristentum vs. papistisch-konfessionalisiertes Christentum; artes, historia und Künste vs. Naturforschung, Technik, 'Neue Wissenschaft' usw.)? Ein recht eindrucksvolles Beispiel findet sich in der schon genannten *Histoire et Apologie de la Retraite des Pasteurs* von Élie Benoist (1687), gegen die d'Artis seine *Sentiments désintéressés* (Deventer 1688) publizierte (vgl. oben Anm. 4).

Benoît, selbst Pastor, der sich nach Deventer gerettet hat, schreibt in der *Préface* (in meiner Übersetzung):

Die drei oder vier letzten Jahre haben Ereignisse von solcher Einmaligkeit gebracht, daß ich nicht glaube, daß man im ganzen Altertum ähnliche findet. Wir haben auf der einen Seite so viel Bosheit und Grausamkeit erlebt und auf der anderen so viel verzweifelte Schwäche, daß man wohl sagen kann, das eine wie das andere sind ohne Beispiel in der Vergangenheit. Danach gibt es keinen Zweifel mehr: Was da geschah, zählt nicht nur zu den Dingen, die wegen ihrer Seltenheit bei Herodot als märchenhaft betrachtet wurden, sondern zu denen, die die Alten einfach unglaublich nannten. Denn die Umstände, die die Geschichten der Alten wie Romane aussehen lassen, sind nicht weniger wahrscheinlich als das, was wir in Frankreich erlebt haben . . .

Auch wenn man gewiß nicht unterstellen kann, daß der Autor, der ganz andere Sorgen hat, damit einen Anschluß an die hochoffizielle *Querelle* beabsichtigt, zeigt doch der Diskurs selbst an dieser Stelle eine Option, die den gelehrten Alternativen eine andere hinzufügt, nämlich die der aktuellen Erfahrung, die über den Erfahrungshorizont der Alten immer schon hinaus ist. Wie man weiß, ist diese Option auch der akademischen Diskussion nicht fremd und war es in früheren Jahrhunderten noch weniger, wenn um *praestantia nostri aevi* (der Titel des berühmten Dialogs des Florentiners Benedetto Accolti von ca. 1460) oder dergleichen gestritten wurde. Nur wurde auch dieses Argument ggf. an kulturellen Objekten, an Texten, Erfindungen, Bauwerken festgemacht, nicht aber an dieser Erfahrung selbst. Auch das könnte zu den Zügen gerade auch an der Publizistik des *Refuge* zählen, auf die hin auch der Journalismus zu durchforschen wäre. Aber das müßte erst noch geschehen.

## 5.

Eine letzte Feststellung. Ein Argument für die Besonderheit des reformierten Journalismus findet man immer wieder: Die betreffenden Journale seien von Themen und Publikationen der 'literarischen

Kultur' abgerückt, mit oder ohne Hinweis auf die Kunstfeindlichkeit des Calvinismus; Poesie, Roman und Theater kämen im Verhältnis zu Theologie, Konfessionsstreit, Philosophie, Naturforschung, Geschichte, Jurisprudenz, Politik zu kurz. Diese Rechnung, die sich auch bei Haase findet, überzeugt ganz besonders wenig, weil sie auf anachronistische Vorstellungen von literarischem Interesse und Titelsektion zurückgeht. Denn ein längerer Blick in die Geschichte der Buchkritik lehrt, daß die Auswahl von 'Belletristik' als Gegenstand der Berichterstattung und Kritik in den Journalen aller Art in dieser Zeit noch ziemlich selten ist, wie ja auch die Bedeutung der 'Literatur' selbst in diesem späteren engeren Sinn des Wortes in der Gelehrtenkultur der frühen Neuzeit bis mindestens um die Wende zum 18. Jh. höchst marginal ist (natürlich mit großen Unterschieden je nach den verschiedenen Nationalkulturen). Es ist lediglich die 'Poesie', die Dichtung in gebundener Sprache, und allenfalls noch die ernstesten dramatischen Gattungen, die seit der Antike dem am nächsten kommen, was mit dem Literaturbegriff gemeint ist, der sich in Deutschland in einem komplizierten Prozeß erst im Laufe des späteren 18. Jahrhunderts ausdifferenziert. Zu einem normativ aufgeladenen Wertkonzept wird dieser an 'Ästhetik' und 'Kunst' gebundene Begriff von 'Literatur' in Deutschland erst im Diskurs der *Wahrnehmung der Goethezeit* (Klassik-Romantik) durch die Literaturgeschichte und Kritik des 19. Jahrhunderts nicht der Goethezeit selbst, die eine solche Entschiedenheit nicht kennt. So etwas wie ein Kanon der deutschen 'Barockliteratur', der mit der Aufbietung vieler Interpretationskünste als den Spitzenprodukten späterer Literaturepochen ebenbürtig erwiesen wurde, ist aus der Perspektive der Gelehrtenkultur des 17. Jahrhunderts selbst, der alle diese Dichter natürlich angehört haben, ein reines germanistisches Artefakt des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts. Selbst einem 'literarisch interessierten' Leser von 1660 wären selbstverständlich nicht nur die Interpretationen etwa von Grimmelshausen oder Spee semantisch unzugänglicher stände auch der kanonischen Bedeutung solcher Autoren ratlos gegenüber. Man kann dagegen einwenden, man interpretiere die ältere Literatur schließlich nicht für den Verständnishorizont ihrer Zeitgenossen, sondern allenfalls für denjenigen heutiger Leser. Dennoch sollte man die historische Semantik, die der ältere Text mitbringt, nicht übergehen, sondern so gut es geht daran anknüpfen, um nicht auf gänzlich anachronistische Irrwege zu geraten. Man kann die Tatsache jener zeitgenössischen Marginalität sehr schnell z.B. an den systematischen Orten, an den Systemstellen ablesen, an denen solche



Schriften in den gedruckten Katalogen von Privatbibliotheken oder in der Systematik der *Historia litteraria* (also der frühneuzeitlichen Wissenschaftskunde und Wissenschaftsgeschichte) in Erscheinung treten, z.B. im 1. Band des *Polyhistor* von Morhof. Der Journalismus des *Refuge* macht bei alledem keine wirkliche Ausnahme, auch Bayle nicht oder Le Clerc. Am ehesten findet man Kritik von Poesie bzw. 'schöner Literatur' der aktuellen, laufenden Produktion in mehr auf Unterhaltung ausgehenden Journalen, auch als Nachrichten am Rande von eher politischen und an Hofangelegenheiten interessierten Periodica. Aber auch dann überwiegt die Besprechung von Editionen klassischer Autoren. Nur sie sind legitimer Gegenstand der gelehrten Aufmerksamkeit von seiten des *grammaticus* bzw. des *criticus*. Nur Thomasius in den *Monatsgesprächen* bildet eine Ausnahme, aber die stellt dieses Unternehmen in vieler Hinsicht dar. Allerdings ist das Interesse des Thomasius weniger ein 'literarisches' als eines der *Philosophia moralis* bzw. ein moralisches der Satire. Er findet auch in den Romanen "Gedancken" und "Fragen", über die er räsoniert, über die er die Leser zur Diskussion anregt.

Mustert man also die üblichen Gründe für die Rede vom 'Journalismus des *Refuge*', so spricht wahrscheinlich doch sehr wenig für dessen spezifische Ausprägung und sehr viel für die (allerdings nur ganz vorläufige) These, daß es sich dabei um einzelne etwas weiter getriebene Tendenzen handelt, die im Journalwesen der Zeit um 1700 auch sonst vorhanden waren, in Deutschland reduzierter (erweitert allerdings anfangs um die reichhaltigen dialogischen Formen), zumindest aber in den Niederlanden.

Ausgewählte Journale im 17. Jahrhundert/um 1700

<i>Titel</i>	<i>Gründung, Dauer</i>	<i>Ort: Verleger/Drucker</i>	<i>Direktor/Autoren</i>
[Gazette (de France) Le Journal des Savants	1631–1792 Jan. 1665–1792; 1816–	Paris: Bureau d'Adresse Paris: Jean Cusson	Théophraste Renaudot, u.a.] Denis de Sallo, Jean Gallois; J.-P. de la Roche, J.-P. Bignon Henry Oldenburg
Philosophical Transactions Journal du Journal ou Censure de la Censure	März 1665– 1666 (Mai–Juni)	London Saumur	Henry Oldenburg Tannegui Le Fèvre (Tanaquil Faber)
Giornale de' Letterati di Roma	1668–1679	Roma	Francesco Nazari; Michele Angiolo Ricci
Miscellanea curiosa medico-physica academiae naturae curiosorum etc. Le Mercure Galant	1670–1706; 1712ff., 1755ff. 1672–1710	Schweinfurt, Leipzig, Jena, Nürnberg u.a. Paris: Claude Barbin	Ph. J. Sachs, L. Schroeckh J. Donneau de Visé, Fontenelle, u.a.
Acta medica et philosophica Analecta miscella menstrua eruditionis sacrae et profanae	1673–1680 1673–1674	Kopenhagen Meißen: Günther	Thomas Bartholin Matthias Zimmermann
[Gazette de Leyde Journal des découvertes sur toutes les parties de la médecine Acta eruditorum	1680–1798 1681 1682–1731	Leiden] Paris Leipzig: Grosse & Gleditsch	Nicolas de Blegny Otto Mencke, Johann Burchard, Mencke, u.a.
Relationes curiosae Mercure savant	1683–1691 1684	Hamburg: Wiering Amsterdam: Gautier	Eberhard Werner Happel Nicolas de Blegny
Nouvelles de la République des Lettres	März 1684–1718	Amsterdam: Desbordes; später Mortier	Pierre Bayle, D. de Larroque, J. Le Clerc, J. Barrin; J. Bernard
Ephemerides litterariae Giornale de' Letterati per	1686 1686–1690	Hamburg: Langemarck Parma: 1686–1690;	Joachim Ludwig Körber Benedetto Bacchini

tutto l'anno Bibliothèque universelle et historique	1686–1693	Modena: 1692–1697 Amsterdam: Wolfgang	Jean Le Clerc; Jacque Bernard, Cornand de LaCrose
Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants	1687–1709	Rotterdam: Leers	Henri Basnage de Beauval, Jacques Basnage
Freymüthige, lustige und ernsthafte jedoch vernunft- und gesetzmäßige Gedancken oder Monats-Gespräche über allerhand, fürnehmlich aber neue Bücher [ <i>Monatsgespräche</i> ]	1688–1690	Leipzig u. Halle: Weidmann, Saalfeld	Christian Thomasius; 1690: Jakob von Ryssel
Monathliche Unterredungen einiger guten Freunde von allerhand Büchern und anderen annehmlichen Geschichten	1689–1698	Leipzig: Laurer, <i>später</i> Gleditsch, Fritsch	Wilhelm Ernst Tentzel
Monathliche, iedoch unmaßgebliche Gedancken über allerhand vorkommende Sachen in der gelehrten Welt	August 1691	Jena: (Gedruckt im Thal)	Michael Schwimmer (?)
Monathliche Nutz-spielende Lust-Fragen zu gelehrter und ungelehrter sonderbarer Ergetzung	1692	Jena: Bielcke	Michael Schwimmer
Journal d'Amsterdam; Journal de Hambourg	1694; 1694–1696	Amsterdam: Chevalier; Hamburg: Heuss	Gabriel d'Artis
Historische Remarques der neuesten Sachen in Europa	1699–1707	Hamburg: Reumann	Peter Ambrosius Lehmann
Monathlicher Auszug aus allerhand neu-herausgegebenen nützlichen und artigen Büchern	1700–1704	Hannover: Förster	Johann Georg Eccard
Mémoires de Trévoux	1701–1767	Trévoux: Jean Boudot, Étienne Ganeau, u.a. <i>später</i> Paris	Père J.-Ph. Lallement S.J., père R.-J. Tournemine S.J., u.a.

Table (cont.)

<i>Titel</i>	<i>Gründung, Dauer</i>	<i>Ort: Verleger/Drucker</i>	<i>Direktor/ Autoren</i>
Neue Unterredungen, darinnen sowohl schertz-als ernsthaft über allerhand gelehrte und ungelehrte Bücher und Fragen freymüthig und unpartheyisch raisonniret wird	1702 (Jan.–März)	Lützen	Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling
Nutz- und Lust-erweckende Gsellschaft der vertrauten Nachbarn am Isarstrom	1702–1703	München	(?)
Nova litteraria Germaniae	1703	Hamburg: Schiller	Peter Ambrosius Lehmann
Lettres édifiantes et curieuses	1703–1776	Paris: N. Le Clerc u.a.	Père Le Gobien S.J.; père Du Halde S.J., u.a.
Bibliothèque choisie	1703–1713	Amsterdam: Schelte; <i>später</i> Wettstein	Jean Le Clerc
Histoire critique de la République des Lettres, tant ancienne que moderne	1712–1718	Utrecht, Amsterdam: Poolsum, Desbordes	Samuel Masson, Ph. Masson, G. Dumont, A. Des Vignoles,
Journal littéraire	1713–1737	Den Haag: Johnson, Gosse, Néaulme, Swart	s'Gravesande, J. van Effen, Prosper Marchand, Thémiseul de Saint-Hyacinthe, d'Artis (?)
Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne	1714–1727	Amsterdam: Mortier; <i>später</i> Wettstein, Husson	Jean Le Clerc
Bibliothèque germanique ou Histoire littéraire de l'Allemagne et des pays du Nord	1720–1741	Amsterdam: Hubert, Beaugard, Schreuder, Mortier	J. Lenfant, I. de Beausobre, A. Des Vignoles, P. E. Mauclerc, J. H. S. Formey
Nouvelle Bibliothèque germanique	1746–1760	Amsterdam: Mortier	J. H. S. Formey
Bibliothèque impartiale	1750–1758	Leiden: Luzac; <i>später</i> auch Göttingen	J. H. S. Formey

*Französische Journale in Berlin (1694–1779)*

<i>Titel</i>	<i>Gründung, Dauer</i>	<i>Ort: Verleger/Drucker</i>	<i>Direktor/Autoren</i>
Nouveau Journal des Savants	1694–1695, 1695–1698	Rotterdam: van der Slaart; Berlin: Robert Roger, <i>später</i> Michael Rüdiger	Étienne Chauvin
Mercure et Minerve	1737–1738	Berlin: Johann Peter Schmid	J. H. S. Formey
Journal de Berlin	1740–1741	Berlin: Ambroise Haude	J. H. S. Formey
Le Spectateur en Allemagne	1742	(Berlin)	Joseph Du Fresne de Francheville
Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Berlin	1745–1769	Berlin: Ambroise Haude, Hof- und Akademiebuchhändler; Haude & Spener; Christian Friedrich Voß	Formey; d'Alembert, Lambert, Euler, Bernoulli
Bibliothèque critique	1746	Berlin	J. H. S. Formey
L'Abeille du Parnasse	1750–1757	Berlin	J. H. S. Formey
Journal Épistolaire	1755	Berlin: de Bourdeaux, königl. Hofbuchhändler	J. H. S. Formey
Mélanges littéraires et philosophiques	1755–1756	Berlin: Klüter	'Une société de gens de lettres', Maupertuis u.a.
Lettres sur l'état présent des sciences et des mœurs	1759–1760	Berlin: Haude & Spener	J. H. S. Formey
Préservatif contre la corruption de la Langue Française	1759–1764	Berlin: Grynäus und Decker; Georg Ludwig Winter	André Pierre Le Guay de Prémontval
Nouveaux Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Berlin	1770–1786	Berlin: Christian Friedrich Voß	Beausobre, Bernoulli, de Castillon, Bitaubé, Dénina, Formey, Lambert, Lhuilier, Sulzer, u.a.
Recueil pour les Astronomes	1771–1779	Berlin: Chez l'Auteur, und Haude & Spener; Paris: Desaints	Jean Bernoulli, u.a.

Table (*cont.*)

<i>Titel</i>	<i>Gründung, Dauer</i>	<i>Ort: Verleger/Drucker</i>	<i>Direktor/Autoren</i>
Nouvelles littéraires de Berlin	1772–1774	Berlin: de Bourdeaux	
Journal littéraire de Berlin	1772–1776	Berlin: Georg Jakob Decker	D. Thiébault, de Castillon Sulzer, Beausobre
Nouvelles littéraires de divers pays	1776–1779	Berlin: Haude & Spener	Jean Bernoulli, Jean-Henri Lambert
Supplement au Recueil pour	1776–1779	Berlin: Chez l'Auteur, les Astronomes und Haude & Spener	Jean Bernoulli

LEKTÜRE, BILDUNG, WISSENSKANON:  
JEAN-HENRI-SAMUEL FORMEYS RATSCHLÄGE ZUM  
AUFBAU EINER PRIVATBIBLIOTHEK  
IM 18. JAHRHUNDERT

Annett Volmer

S'il n'y avoit point de livres,  
nous serions tous ignorants et grossiers,  
le même tombeau qui couvre les corps,  
auroit englouti les noms célèbres.<sup>1</sup>

Mit der Publikation des Bibliotheksratgebers *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse mais choisie* nahm Formey eine Tradition auf, die im 17. Jahrhundert von Gabriel Naudé und François de La Mothe le Vayer geprägt worden war.<sup>2</sup> Der Ratgeber des Berliner Akademie-sekretärs weist jedoch entscheidende Neuerungen auf, die hauptsächlich in der besseren Handhabe, der effektiveren Gliederung und inhaltlichen Erweiterung bestehen. Naudé gliederte seinen Bibliotheksratgeber nicht nach einzelnen Disziplinen, sondern nach den wichtigsten Grundsätzen für den Aufbau einer Bibliothek. Formeys Plan beruft sich stärker auf den Bibliotheksratgeber von François de La Mothe le Vayer, dessen Sichtweise auf Literatúrauswahl, Ziel und Zweck des Büchererwerbs in Form eines Briefes der zweiten Ausgabe der *Conseils* vorangestellt wird.<sup>3</sup> Für La Mothe le Vayer ist der Kauf von ungefähr einhundert Büchern die Grundlage eines kontinuierlichen Studiums und fortgesetzten Wissenserwerb neben dem Besuch öffentlicher Bibliotheken.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse, mais choisie*. Berlin: Haude et Spener 1756, S. 101–102.

<sup>2</sup> Gabriel Naudé: *Avis pour dresser une bibliothèque*. Paris 1627; François de La Mothe le Vayer: *Du moyen de dresser une bibliothèque d'une centaine de livres seulement*, in: Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse mais choisie*. Seconde édition, corrigée et augmentée. Berlin: Haude et Spener 1750, unpaginiert [S. 10–22]. Originaltext: François de La Mothe le Vayer: *Oeuvres*. Nouv. éd. et augm. Dresde: M. Groell, 1756–59. [Erste Ausgabe von 1648].

<sup>3</sup> François de La Mothe le Vayer: *Du moyen de dresser une bibliothèque d'une centaine de livres seulement*, in: Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse, mais choisie*. Seconde édition, corrigée et augmentée. Berlin: Haude et Spener 1750, unpaginiert [S. 10–22].

Zwei wesentliche Unterschiede lassen sich zwischen den Ratgebern von La Mothe le Vayer und Formey feststellen: Während La Mothe le Vayer die heimische Handbibliothek des Gelehrten im Blick hat und ratsame Tips gibt, wie die Studien dank einschlägiger Nachschlagewerke und Wörterbücher auch zu Hause fortgesetzt werden können, entfaltet Formey einen Wissenskanon für gebildete, aber nicht gelehrte Leser mit konkreten Titelangaben. Autoren, einzelne Titel und zu berücksichtigende Wissenschaften werden auch von La Mothe le Vayer benannt, doch nicht in der Übersichtlichkeit und Kürze wie bei Formey. Der markanteste inhaltliche Unterschied ist durch das anvisierte Lesepublikum bedingt und besteht in der Berücksichtigung der *Belles-Lettres*, die bei La Mothe le Vayer nicht vertreten sind.

Die *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque*, die Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey 1746 erstmals herausgab, sind ein Paradebeispiel für die Entwicklung dieser Textsorte zu einem pädagogischen Instrument mit Bildungsfunktion. Die versammelten Lektüreempfehlungen sollen Wegweiser und Orientierungshilfen darstellen, zugleich sind die nachfolgenden Editionen aus den Jahren 1750, 1755 und 1756 ein Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Lesekultur und ein Index tradierter Texte.

In der folgenden Untersuchung liegt der Fokus auf dem Begriff des Kanons: Inwieweit kann im Fall der *Conseils* von einem verbindlichen, dezidiert protestantischen Wissenskanon gesprochen werden? Wie sah dieser von einem der höchsten Repräsentanten der französischen Gemeinde in Preußen empfohlene Lektürekanon aus? Wie veränderte sich dieser Kanon im Laufe der Neueditionen? Diese Fragen können durch die Analyse des Aufbaus der vier Editionen der *Conseils* sowie der Rekonstruktion und des Vergleichs der vertretenen Wissensgebiete beantwortet werden.<sup>4</sup>

Die literarische Kanonforschung definiert kanonische Texte als jene Texte, an deren Überlieferung dauerhaft und intensiv gearbeitet

---

<sup>4</sup> Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse mais choisie*. Berlin: Haude et Spener 1746. [hier zitiert als *Conseils* (1746)] Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse mais choisie*. Seconde édition, corrigée et augmentée. Berlin: Haude et Spener 1750. [hier zitiert als *Conseils* (1750)] Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse, mais choisie*. Troisième Edition, corrigée et augmentée. Avec une notice des ouvrages de l'Auteur. Berlin: Haude et Spener 1755 [hier zitiert als *Conseils* (1755)] Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey: *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse, mais choisie*. Nouvelle édition, corrigée et augmentée. Suivie de l'Introduction générale à l'Etude des Sciences & Belles-Lettres par M. de la Martinière. Berlin: Haude et Spener (eigentlich Paris, Briasson) 1756. [hier zitiert als *Conseils* (1756)].



wird, z.B. durch Literaturlexika, Verlagsprogramme, Vorlesungsverzeichnisse oder Theaterspielpläne. Der kulturwissenschaftliche Ansatz der Kanonforschung interessiert sich für den realen statt impliziten Leser, für die sozialen Zusammenhänge zwischen Text und Mensch statt für intertextuelle Beziehungen.<sup>5</sup> Inspiriert von dem methodischen Ansatz Rüdiger Zymners, der Anspielungen auf Texte als Indikatoren für eine bestimmte Textkenntnis versteht, sollen die sich anschließenden Ausführungen einen Beitrag zur Empirisierung der Kanonforschung leisten.<sup>6</sup> Kanones wurden bislang vornehmlich als Resultate, Ziele und Mittel von Wertungen in den Blick genommen, im vorliegenden Zusammenhang geht es um den *Prozeß* der Kanonbildung. Der Bibliotheksratgeber Formeys kann dank seiner Nachauflagen mit dem Fokus auf Veränderungen und Abweichungen untersucht werden. Zweifelsohne sind die getroffenen Aussagen nur begrenzt verallgemeinerbar, doch können wir davon ausgehen, daß Formey als repräsentativer Vertreter der preußischen reformierten Bildungselite mit seiner Publikation eine Wissensordnung vorgibt, deren Texte Bestandteil kollektiv gebilligt und geschätzt wurden. Für die Mitglieder einer bestimmten Gruppe, wie hier der Refugiés, kann man daher von einer kanonbezogenen Sozialisation sprechen, die sich im vorliegenden Kontext verfolgt werden wird.

### 1. *“Pour le progrès des vertus”*—Anliegen und Plan der Conseils

Nur im Vorwort zur dritten Ausgabe von 1755 findet sich der Hinweis, auf wessen Anregung die *Conseils* zurückgehen. Ludwig Wilhelm Graf von Münchow<sup>7</sup> hatte Formey in einem Brief gebeten, eine kurze Aufstellung der wichtigsten Bücher zu geben, die jede private Bibliothek beinhalten sollte:

<sup>5</sup> Aleida Assmann: Kanonforschung als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft, in: Kanon—Macht—Kultur. Theoretische, historische und soziale Aspekte ästhetischer Kanonbildung, hg. v. Renate von Heydebrand. Stuttgart 1998, S. 47–59.

<sup>6</sup> Rüdiger Zymner: Anspielung und Kanon, in: Kanon—Macht—Kultur. Theoretische, historische und soziale Aspekte ästhetischer Kanonbildung, hg. v. Renate von Heydebrand. Stuttgart 1998, S. 30–46. Vgl. auch: Günter Berger: Verordnete und vollzogene Kanonisierung. Formen und Prozesse literarischer Selektion im Frankreich der Aufklärung, in: Komparatistische Hefte 13 (1986), S. 13–21.

<sup>7</sup> Ludwig Wilhelm Graf von Münchow (1709–23.9.1753 Breslau), Staatsmann, wirklicher Geheimer Etatsminister, Minister für Schlesien, seit 1744 Ehrenmitglied der Berliner Akademie.

Je ne sais, Monsieur, si cela ne seroit pas une occupation trop peu digne d'un academicien, que de tracer un plan d'une petite Bibliothèque de 5 jusqu'à 600 volumes, en indiquant ce que dans toutes sortes de sciences il pourroit y avoir de meilleur. C'est pourtant ce qu'on souhaite beaucoup dans ce pays cy. Il y a plusieurs seigneurs et entre eux surtout le Duc d'Oels, qui [. . .] souhaite de se faire une petite amas de tous les livres les plus utiles et les meilleurs dans chaque genre de sciences.<sup>8</sup>

Noch im gleichen Jahr kam Formey der Bitte des Grafen nach und schickte ihm die erste Ausgabe der *Conseils*. In der Breslauer Gesellschaft, in der Münchow verkehrte, war der Wunsch nach Übersichtlichkeit, Qualität und Anleitung bei der Lektüre ebenso groß wie in anderen Provinzen Preußens. Die Idee jedoch, die einzelnen Ratschläge zu bündeln und eine eigene Bibliothek zu planen, stammte aus dem Breslauer Kreis. Formey erkannte die Nützlichkeit dieses Vorhabens und ließ seine Ratschläge drucken, denn viele Korrespondenten fragten ihn nach seinem Urteil über verschiedene Werke.<sup>9</sup>

Jede einzelne Edition wird von einem *Avant-propos* präludiert, das den Plan, das Ziel und die Resonanz beim Publikum widerspiegelt. In den geringfügig überarbeiteten Einleitungen vermittelt Formey ein kontroverses Bild der Rezeption seines Werkes. Die Lobredner motivieren ihn zu neuen Ausgaben, die Kritiker zu besseren.

Die Beschäftigung mit sinnvoller Lektüre schätzt Formey als die fruchtbarste Art des Lernens ein. Ein wesentliches Kriterium der pragmatischen Auswahl sieht er in der Beschränkung auf eine kleine Anzahl von Büchern. Schließlich ging es um gewöhnliche Anschaffungskapazitäten eines gebildeten Privatmannes, nicht um eine Gelehrtenbibliothek.<sup>10</sup> Formeys ursprüngliche Absicht war keine kommerzielle: Er wollte einen Plan entwerfen, der es den Lesern erlaubte, die besten Bücher aus verschiedenen Wissensgebieten in ihrer Bibliothek zu versammeln. Nicht der Umfang der Sammlung war dafür entscheidend, sondern die Auswahl von fünf- bis sechshundert Bänden, mit denen eine Privatbibliothek ausgestattet sein sollte. Ausgehend von zwei unterschiedlichen Modi der Lektüre, dem berufsmäßigen Lesen der Gelehrten und dem zweckfreien Lesen von Laien in der Freizeit,

<sup>8</sup> Ludwig Wilhelm Münchow an Formey, Breslau, 1. Juni 1746. NL Formey, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.

<sup>9</sup> Vgl. die sehr umfangreiche Korrespondenz Jean-Henri-Samuel Formeys, die aus über 17 000 Briefen besteht und hauptsächlich in der Staatsbibliothek Berlin und der Jagellionen-Bibliothek in Krakau aufbewahrt wird.

<sup>10</sup> *Conseils* (1746): Avant-propos, unpaginiert [S. 13].

unterstreicht Formey sein Interesse an der zweiten Lesergruppe. Er möchte jenen Lesern einige Hilfestellungen erweisen, die in der Auswahl ihrer Lektüre unsicher sind und ihr Geld nicht in schlechte Werke investieren wollen. Nicht der bibliophile Liebhaber, der nur eine optisch schöne Bibliothek besitzen möchte, ist angesprochen, sondern der Herr und die Dame von Geist, mit Geschmack und Kenntnis, die sich instruktive und angenehme Lektüremomente zu verschaffen suchen.

Der Textvergleich der Ausgabe von 1746 mit den folgenden Neuauflagen von 1750, 1755 und 1756 erlaubt Einsichten in die zeitgenössischen Auffassungen von verbindlichen Referenztexten. Mit der Empfehlung zur privaten Anschaffung ist eine implizite Bewertung verbunden: Lohnt dieses oder jenes Buch—in einem Zeitalter, das die Taschenbuchausgabe noch nicht kannte—den finanziellen Aufwand? Die Analyse der *Conseils* vermittelt zudem Einsichten in die Rangfolge der aufgenommenen Wissensgebiete.

## 2. Die Erstausgabe von 1746

Der Berliner Akademiesekretär hat den Ratgeber in seiner gewohnt schnellen Manier verfaßt. Seine Methode bestand hauptsächlich darin, nichts Wesentliches auslassen zu wollen.<sup>11</sup> Häufig benennt er nur die Autoren ohne die präzisen Titel beizufügen. Mitunter differieren die zitierten von den tatsächlichen Titelangaben im Wortlaut. In der Regel privilegierte er innerhalb der Kapitel einzelne Autoren, auf die ich in der inhaltlichen Darstellung des Ratgebers verweisen werde. Die Eile, mit der die erste Ausgabe entstand, wird an dem beigefügten Supplement deutlich: Die Drucklegung der *Conseils* hatte bereits begonnen, als dem Verfasser noch Lektürehinweise einfielen. Ein Charakteristikum ist auch die oberflächliche Beurteilung der empfohlenen Werke. Formey gibt hin und wieder Negativurteile zu einzelnen Autoren ab, die er jedoch nicht weiter begründet. Allein die Aufnahme eines Werkes ohne explizite Begründung steht für eine Empfehlung zur Anschaffung. Seinen konkreten Titelvorschlägen schickt Formey nur eine Regel voraus, die der Käufer beim Erwerb von Büchern unbedingt beachten sollte: Wenn nicht anders vermerkt, sollte er stets die neueste Ausgabe eines Buches anschaffen.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Conseils* (1746): Avant-propos.

Aus verschiedenen Bemerkungen des Verfassers läßt sich schließen, daß die Reihenfolge der einzelnen Kapitel einer Rangfolge entspricht. . . la Théologie est la plus noble de toutes les connoissances . . .”<sup>12</sup> Diese Organisation der Kapitel bleibt in allen Ausgaben unverändert und gehorcht zugleich einer Wertigkeit, die den einzelnen Wissensgebieten zugewiesen wird: “Théologie”, “Philosophie”, “Belles-Lettres”, “Journaux”, “Histoire”, “Romans”, “Poésie”, “Eloquence”, “Moral et Goût”, “Histoire militaire et mathématiques”, “Géographie et voyage”, “Jurisprudence et médecine”.

Die *Conseils* eröffnen mit der “wichtigsten” Wissenschaft: der Theologie (“Article 1: Ecriture sainte, Théologie et histoire ecclésiastique”). Der erste Literaturhinweis bleibt immer die Heilige Schrift, “la plus ancienne & la plus autorisée de toutes les Histories”.<sup>13</sup> Obwohl Formey bei seinem Publikum die Kenntnis der jeweiligen Originalsprache voraussetzt, in der der ursprüngliche Text verfaßt wurde, empfiehlt er dennoch, die besten Bibelversionen in der Muttersprache, der französischen Sprache, zu erwerben.

Die imaginierte Bibliothek Formeys ist eine französischsprachige Bibliothek und verweist auf ein Lesepublikum, das gebildet, europäisch, frankophon und protestantisch ist. Wie der Fall des Ideengebers Münchow offenbart, ist der Bibliotheksratgeber allerdings nicht ausschließlich an ein hugenottisches Publikum gerichtet, sondern ebenso an preußische Landadlige, bürgerliche Gebildete und Pastoren. Die sich anschließende inhaltliche Übersicht über die empfohlenen Werke wird zeigen, daß vor allem in den Kapiteln zur Theologie und Philosophie die Werke der Autoren des *Refuge* dominieren.

Die protestantische französische Bibelübersetzung stammte von Olivétan und erschien 1535 in Neuchâtel. Im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert folgte Revision auf Revision dieser Übersetzung. Eine der wichtigsten Neubearbeitungen war die 1707 in Amsterdam erschienene Neubearbeitung von David Martin, die Formey nachdrücklich empfiehlt, da sie die von Samuel Desmarets bei weitem übertreffe.<sup>14</sup> Neben

---

<sup>12</sup> François de La Mothe le Vayer: Du Moyen de dresser une Bibliothèque d’une centaine de livres seulement, in: *Conseils* (1750), unpaginiert.

<sup>13</sup> *Conseils* (1746). S. 1.

<sup>14</sup> La sainte Bible, qui contient le Vieux & le Nouveau Testament, avec des Notes par Mr. Martin, 2 vol. Amsterdam 1707. Maresius (des Marets), Samuel (1599–1673). La Sainte Bible (avec un large Commentaire) enrichie outre les anciennes notes, de toutes celles de la Bible flamande, de la pluspart de celles de Diodati & de beaucoup d’autres, par S. des Mareets, avec des Cartes, 2 vol. Amsterdam: Elzevier 1669.

einer kleinen Anzahl von Kommentaren, Katechismen, Apologien und kirchengeschichtlichen Werken, schließt Formey Abhandlungen über die Theologie als Wissenschaftsdisziplin absichtlich aus, da diese in den gelehrten Bereich fallen. Als ein Werk, das die Wahrheiten des Glaubens und die Pflichten der Moral mit Klarheit herausstellt, benennt er Johann Gustav Reinbecks *Confession von Augsburg*.<sup>15</sup> Mit ausführlichen Hinweisen zu Jacques Lenfant, Isaac de Beausobre und Jacques Abbadie ist die protestantische Färbung des Kapitels offensichtlich.<sup>16</sup> Eine Geschichte der Päpste hält Formey trotzdem für empfehlenswert. Ob der Leser von diesem Ratschlag allerdings profitieren kann, bleibt fraglich: Formey benennt weder einen genauen Titel noch den Autor.

Als zweites Kapitel folgt die Philosophie. Für die Leser, die der lateinischen Sprache mächtig sind und einige Studien in der Geometrie betrieben haben, komme das Studium der vier bekanntesten Philosophen der letzten Jahrhunderte in Frage: René Descartes, Pierre Gassendi, Isaac Newton und Christian Wolff.

Aus dem umfangreichen Oeuvre von Christian Wolff empfiehlt Formey die Anschaffung der deutschen Werke und nicht der lateinischen. Erstere seien verständlicher und für ein interessiertes Laienpublikum gedacht. Die Geschichte der Philosophie ist mit dem Grundlagenwerk von Johann Jacob Brucker vertreten.<sup>17</sup> Einblicke in die Metaphysik erhält der Leser am besten bei John Locke, natürlich dürfe auch die *Théodizee* von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz nicht fehlen.<sup>18</sup> Als die lesbarsten und nützlichsten Bücher hält Formey jene

---

<sup>15</sup> Johann Gustav Reinbeck: Betrachtungen über die in der Augsburgischen Confession enthaltene und damit verknüpfte göttliche Wahrheiten; welche theils aus vernünftigen Gründen, allesammt aber aus Heiliger göttlicher Schrift hergeleitet werden, angestellt u. hrsg. von Johann Gustav Reinbeck. Th. 1–3. Berlin & Leipzig: Haude 1731–36. 2 Bde 8°.

<sup>16</sup> Isaac de Beausobre, Jacques Lenfant: Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ, traduit en françois sur l'original grec avec des notes literales. Amsterdam: Pierre Humbert 1719; Isaac de Beausobre: Remarques historiques, critiques et philologiques sur le Nouveau Testament. La Haye 1742; Jacques Abbadie: Traité de la Vérité de la Réligion chrétienne. Rotterdam 1684, 2 vol.

<sup>17</sup> Johann Jacob Brucker: Historia critica philosophiae. Lipsiae: Breitkopf 1742.

<sup>18</sup> John Locke: Essai philosophique concernant l'entendement humain ou l'on montre quelle est l'etendue de nos connoissances certaines la manière, dont nous y parvenons. traduit de l'anglois par Pierre Coste. 4. éd. rev., corr. & augm. de quelques additions importantes de l'auteur qui n'ont paru qu'après sa mort, & de plusieurs remarques du traducteur. A Amsterdam, chez Pierre Mortier 1742; Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Essai de Theodicée, sur la Bonté de dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal. Amsterdam: Mortier 1720.

über Physik von Guillaume Derham, René Réaumur und Pierre van Musschenbroek.<sup>19</sup> Die Nennung von René-Antoine Ferchault de Réaumur (1683–1757) an dieser Stelle bleibt etwas fragwürdig, da Réaumur in erster Linie Botaniker war und seine bekanntesten Werke auf dem Gebiet der “Histoire naturelle” veröffentlicht hat. Kurz werden spezielle Gebiete der Physik mit Pierre Moreau de Maupertuis und Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle gestreift.<sup>20</sup> Formey läßt aber die ungewollte “Nähe” beider Autoren nicht unkommentiert:

Je n'indique que ces deux titres de peur de mésallier deux Auteurs, dont le dernier a fait pendant plus d'un demisiècle l'ornement de toutes les Académies de France & dont le premier aggregé à toutes les Compagnies savantes de l'Europe, est devenu par le choix du plus sage des Monarques le chef & en quelque sorte l'âme de celle de Berlin.<sup>21</sup>

Die reichsten Quellen zu allen philosophischen Fragen seien jedoch die Memoiren der verschiedenen Akademien, von denen die Pariser Akademie als die wichtigste hervorgehoben wird, nicht zuletzt aus dem Grund, weil ihre Akten regelmäßig seit 1699 erscheinen. Das Kapitel endet mit dem Hinweis auf die Wichtigkeit der Enzyklopädien von Etienne Chauvin in lateinischer Sprache, Johann Georg Walch in deutscher Sprache und der englischen *Chambers-Encyclopédie*, die mit dem besten Qualitativ versehen wird.<sup>22</sup> Von letzterer—so merkt Formey in der Ausgabe von 1746 an—sei wohl eine französische Ausgabe geplant, “que je ne sais quels contretemps ont derangé.”<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> René A. Réaumur: *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des insectes*. Amsterdam: Mortier 1737; Guillaume Derham: *Théologie physique ou demonstration de l'existence et des attributs de dieu, tirée des oeuvres de la creation*. Rotterdam: Bernan 1730; Pierre van Musschenbroek: *Essai de physique* (trad. du holl. par Pierre Massuet). Leyden: Luchtmans 1739.

<sup>20</sup> Pierre Louis Moreau de Maupertuis: *La figure de la terre: déterminée par les observations des Messieurs de Maupertuis, Clairaut, Camus, Le Monnier et de M. l'abbé Outhier, accompagnés de M. Celsius, faites par ordre du roy au cercle polaire*. Paris: Imprimerie royale 1738; Fontenelle: *Entretiens sur la pluralité des Mondes*. Nouv. édition. Amsterdam: Roger 1719.

<sup>21</sup> *Conseils* (1746), S. 11.

<sup>22</sup> Etienne Chauvin: *Lexicon philosophicum secundis*. Leovardiae: Halma 1713; Johann Georg Walch: *Philosophisches Lexicon: darinnen die in allen Theilen der Philosophie als Logic, Metaphysic, Physic, Pneumatic, Ethic, natuerlichen Theologie und Rechtsgelehrsamkeit, wie auch Politic fuerkommenden Materien und Kunstwoerter erklæret und aus der Historie erlaeutert*. 2. Auflage, Leipzig: Gleditsch 1733; Ephraim Chambers: *Cyclopaedia or, an universal Dictionary of arts and sciences*. 5. ed., London 1727.

<sup>23</sup> *Conseils* (1746), S. 12. Formey war ein wichtiger Ideengeber und früher Artikelverfasser der späteren *Encyclopédie* von Diderot und d'Alembert, zu deren

Die einzelnen Kapitel sind in der Regel so aufgebaut, daß sie mit den Überblicksdarstellungen beginnen und mit Publikationen zu Einzelthemen enden. Formey gewährleistet dadurch einen systematischen Aufbau der einzelnen Wissensgebiete. Das Kapitel „Belles-Lettres“ weicht von diesem Aufbau ab, da hier die ästhetischen Vorlieben des Einzelnen dominieren. Ein einheitlicher Überblick über die schöne Literatur sei somit schwer möglich, vielmehr gehe es darum, Hinweise zu Textsammlungen, Nachschlage- und Übersichtswerken zu geben.

Mit einem viel zu kurzen Verweis werden die antiken Autoren abgehandelt: “[. . .] je n’indiquerai pourtant ni les auteurs, ni les éditions parce que généralement parlant ceux auxquels ces livres conviennent ont les lumières suffisantes pour les acquérir.”<sup>24</sup> Mit der Beschränkung auf Bernard de Montfauçons *Antiquité expliquée* bleibt dieses Gebiet unterrepräsentiert.<sup>25</sup>

Pierre Bayle’s *Dictionnaire historique et critique* wird als einzigartig und unnachahmbar hervorgehoben. Unter den zuletzt erschienenen Ausgaben von 1720, 1730 und 1740, empfiehlt Formey die Ausgabe von 1730.<sup>26</sup> Das Werk von Louis Moréri sei hingegen ein “mal nécessaire”, das vor Fehler wimmele und völlig chaotisch organisiert sei.<sup>27</sup> Adrien Baillet und Claude Pierre Goujet hätten sehr nützliche Werke zur Literaturgeschichte veröffentlicht.<sup>28</sup>

Neben dem Leben und den Werken der Literaten sei die Numismatik ein Gebiet, das nicht unberücksichtigt bleiben dürfe. Die großen

Verlegern anfangs Antoine-Claude Briasson zählte. Vgl. *Correspondance passive de Formey. Antoine-Claude Briasson et Nicolas-Charles-Joseph Trublet. Lettres adressées à Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey (1739–1770). Textes édités par Martin Fontius, Rolf Geissler et Jens Häselser.* Paris, Genève 1996, S. 12.

<sup>24</sup> *Conseils* (1746), S. 13.

<sup>25</sup> Bernard de Montfauçon: *L’Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures.* Paris: Delaulne 1719–1724.

<sup>26</sup> Pierre Bayle: *Dictionnaire historique et critique. Quatrième Edition, revue, corrigée et augmentée. avec la vie de l’auteur par Mr. des Maizeaux.* A Leide: Samuel Luchtmans 1730.

<sup>27</sup> Louis Moreri: *Grand Dictionnaire historique ou mélange curieux de l’Histoire sacrée & profane,* par M. Moréri. Amsterdam: Boom, Someren, Mortier, 1694.

<sup>28</sup> Adrien Baillet: *Jugements des savants sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs.* Nouv. ed. Amsterdam 1725. Claude Pierre Goujet, *Bibliothèque française ou l’histoire de la littérature française: Dans laquelle on montre l’utilité que l’on peut retirer des livres publiés en François depuis l’origine de l’imprimerie, pour la connoissance des Belles-Lettres, de l’Histoire, des Sciences & des Arts.* Paris: Pierre-Jean Mariette 1740–1756.

und wertvollen Sammlungen seien allerdings gar nicht erstrebenswert, vielmehr gelte eine gute Einführung in die Kenntnis verschiedener Münzen und Medaillen als nützlich und ausreichend.<sup>29</sup>

Die Mythologie ist mit Antoine Barnier und dem *Dictionnaire mythologique* von André de Claustré vertreten.<sup>30</sup> Wörterbücher, Grammatiken und Betrachtungen über die Sprache runden das Kapitel ab. Obwohl das *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* als Code der französischen Sprache anzusehen ist, stünden diesem das *Dictionnaire de Furetière* und mehrere Ausgaben des *Richelet* in nichts nach. Zu den Sprachpuristen werden Dominique Bouhours und Claude Vaugelas gezählt; die besten Grammatiken würden von de Pierre de La Touche und Pierre Restaut stammen.<sup>31</sup>

Der nachfolgende Artikel zu den Zeitschriften ist in gewisser Weise eine Fortsetzung des Kapitels "Belles-Lettres". Ziel und Aufgabe der Zeitschriften werden auch in diesem Sinne definiert: Zeitschriften sollen denjenigen Lesern, die wenig Zeit haben oder nicht über die finanziellen Mittel verfügen, einen Zugang zur Literatur eröffnen. Zeitschriftenlektüre sei wichtig, um den gegenwärtigen Zustand der *République des Lettres* erfassen zu können. Vor allem die guten Journale könne man noch nach einigen Jahren mit viel Nutzen lesen. Seit Denis de Sallo, dem "Vater des Zeitschriftenwesens",<sup>32</sup> hätten periodische Publikationen dermaßen zugenommen, daß nur auf die besten Zeitschriften verwiesen werden könnte. Pierre Bayles *Nouvelles de la République des lettres* (1684–1718) sei die Krönung dieses Genres. Zu den geschätzten Zeitschriften gehören ebenfalls das *Journal des savants* (1665–1792), Jean Le Clercs *Bibliothèque universelle et historique* (1686–1693), die *Bibliothèque choisie* (Jean Le Clerc, 1701–1713), die *Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne* (Jean Le Clerc, 1714–1727) oder die *Mémoires de Trévoux*

<sup>29</sup> Louis Jobert: La science des medailles pour l'instruction de ceux qui s'appliquent à la connoissance des medailles antiques & modernes. Paris: Cramoisy 1693.

<sup>30</sup> Antoine Barnier: La Mythologie et les fables expliquées par l'histoire. Paris: Briasson 1738–40; André de Claustré (Abbé): Dictionnaire de mythologie, pour l'intelligence des poètes, de l'histoire fabuleuse, des monuments historiques, des bas-reliefs, des tableaux etc. Paris: Briasson 1745.

<sup>31</sup> Dominique Bouhours: Remarques nouvelles sur la langue française. Paris 1682; Claude F. de Vaugelas: Remarques de M. de Vaugelas sur la langue française, avec les notes de Olivier Patru & Thomas Corneille. Paris: Piget 1738; Pierre de La Touche: L'Art de bien parler français, qui comprend tout ce qui regarde la grammaire et les façons de parler douteuses. Amsterdam: Arkstee & Merkus 1696; Pierre Restaut: Principes généraux et raisonnés de la grammaire française, avec des observations sur l'orthographe, les accents, & la ponctuation. 6. éd., Paris: N. Lottin 1750.

<sup>32</sup> Conseils (1746), S. 19.



(1701–1767). Die Gründung neuer periodischer Publikationen sei in der Regel wenig erfolgreich, diese könnten sich selten durchsetzen und würden bereits nach kurzer Zeit eingehen. Auf zwei interessante, kurzlebige Periodika wird dennoch verwiesen: den *Le Glaneur françois* (MM. Dreux du Radier et Pesselier, 1735–1737) und die *Amusements du Coeur & de l'Esprit* (Etienne Philippe de Prétot, 1734–1735).

Den Auftakt im Kapitel *Histoire* bildet ein methodologisches Werk von Nicolas Lenglet du Fresnoy.<sup>33</sup> Formey unterscheidet zwischen alter und neuerer Geschichte und verweist als Einstieg in dieses Wissensgebiet auf die Geschichte der Juden als dem ältesten Volk der Welt. Neben einer Geschichte Griechenlands stehen vor allem die Geschichtswerke des Abbé de Vertot im Vordergrund.<sup>34</sup> Zur Geschichte des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Deutscher Nation wird Jean de Hei, zur Kirchengeschichte Bénédict Pictet empfohlen.<sup>35</sup> Die meisten europäischen Königreiche sind mit einschlägigen Geschichtswerken vertreten.

Über einzelne historische Aspekte geben Publikationen unter dem Titel *Mémoires* Auskunft. Bei der Anschaffung dieser beliebten und weitverbreiteten Textgattung mahnt Formey zur Vorsicht, da diese Textsorte häufig von Verfassern mibraucht wird, um sich Glaubwürdigkeit beim Publikum zu verschaffen. Er warnt vor jenen historischen Darstellungen, die—meist unter dem Titel *Histoire de . . .* oder *Mémoires de . . .*—kurz nach dem Tod eines Königs oder eines berühmten Feldherrn erscheinen; hier wird in der Regel mit Eile und wenig Korrektheit gearbeitet.

Historiker und Romanschriftsteller verhalten sich zueinander wie legitime Kinder zu Bastarden—mit diesem Vergleich leitet Formey über zur Abteilung der Romane. Letztlich wird aber kein Zweifel

---

<sup>33</sup> Nicolas Lenglet du Fresnoy: *Méthode pour étudier l'histoire: avec un catalogue des principaux historiens*. Nouv. éd., Amsterdam 1737.

<sup>34</sup> Temple Stanyan: *Histoire de Grèce*, (trad. de l'anglois de Temple Stanyan). Paris: Briasson 1743; René Aubert de Vertot: *Histoire des Révolutions arrivée dans le gouvernement de la République Romaine*. La Haye: van Dole 1737; Ders.: *Histoire des révolutions de Suede, où l'on voit les changements qui sont arrivez dans ce royaume au sujet de la religion & du gouvernement*. La Haye: Gosse 1744; Ders.: *Histoire des révolution de Portugal*. La Haye: van Dole 1734.

<sup>35</sup> Jean de Hei: *Histoire de l'Empire: contenant son origine, son progres, ses révolutions, la forme de son gouvernement, sa politique, ses alliances, ses negociations, et les nouveaux reglements qui ont été faits par les Traités de Westphalie et autres*. Nouvelle édition, augmentée d'un Discours préliminaire. Amsterdam: Wetstein & Smith 1733; Bénédict Pictet: *Histoire de l'Eglise & du monde pour servir de continuation à l'Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire de Mr. le Sueur: avec quelques courtes dissertations et reflexions critiques*. Amsterdam: Mortier 1732.

daran gelassen, daß es zahlreiche gute Romane gibt, die Emotionen auslösen, den Leser in verschiedene Situationen versetzen und somit eine wahre Lust am Text auslösen. Die empfohlene Auswahl von Romanen soll vor allem dem Zweck dienen, schlechte Nachahmungen von originellen Werken unterscheiden zu können. An erster Stelle stehen Romansammlungen wie die *Bibliothèque des Romans* oder die *Bibliothèque de Campagne*.<sup>36</sup> Mit Autoren wie Honoré d'Urfé, Marin L. de Gomberville und Madeleine de Scudery ist das 17. Jahrhundert als eine Glanzepoche des Romans vertreten. Es folgen die Novellen, die ausschließlich durch weibliche Autorinnen repräsentiert sind: Mme de Villedieu, Mme de La Fayette, Mme de Gomez, Mlle de Lussan und Mme la Comtesse d'Aulnoy.<sup>37</sup>

Die zeitgenössischen Romane werden ihrer Komposition nach in drei unterschiedliche Geschmacksrichtungen eingeteilt: In der ersten Richtung dominiert das tragische Moment. Als Hauptvertreter wird Antoine Prevôt d'Exiles angeführt, dessen Werke der Leser komplett besitzen sollte.<sup>38</sup> Seine Romane würden zwar gegen die *vraisemblance* verstoßen, doch seien sie extrem verführerisch, sehr rein im Stil und geschickt in der Komposition. Die zweite, psychologische Richtung, ist durch Pierre de Marivaux vertreten. In seinen Romanen, von denen *Le paysan parvenu* und *La vie de Marianne* empfohlen werden,<sup>39</sup> dienen die Ereignisse nur als Vorwand, um originelle Überlegungen über die menschliche Innenwelt anzustellen. Die Werke des jüngeren Crébillon gehören zur dritten Geschmacksrichtung. Formey weigert sich jedoch, diese konkreter zu definieren. Der Leser möge selbst das

---

<sup>36</sup> Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy: De l'utilité des romans: où l'on fait voir leur utilités et leurs différents caractères; avec une bibliothèque des Romans; accompagnée de remarques critiques sur leur choix et leurs éditions. Amsterdam 1734; Bibliothèque de Campagne, ou Amusements de l'esprit et du coeur. La Haye: Neaulme 1735ff.

<sup>37</sup> Marie Cathérine Hortense Desjardins: Mme de Villedieu, Oeuvres complètes. Paris 1720; Marie M. de la Fayette: La princesse de Clèves. Paris 1768; Madeleine-Angélique Poisson dame Gabriel de Gomez, Les journées amusantes. Paris 1722–1731; Dies.: Les Cent Nouvelles. Paris 1732–39; Marguerite de Lussan: Anecdotes de la Cour de Philippe-Auguste. Paris: Pissot 1733–38; Marie C. d'Aulnoy: Mémoires de la cour d'Espagne. Paris: Barbin 1690; Dies.: Le comte de Warwick. Paris: Par la compagnie des libraires associés 1703.

<sup>38</sup> Antoine François Prevost d'Exiles: Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité, qui s'est retiré du monde. Paris: Thourneisen 1744; Ders.: Le philosophe anglois, ou Histoire de Monsieur Cleveland. Amsterdam: Ryckhoff 1744.

<sup>39</sup> Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux: Le paysan parvenu. Amsterdam 1734–35; Ders.: La vie de Marianne ou les aventures de Madame la Comtesse de \*\*\*. Paris: Prault 1731–34.

Wesentliche in *L'Ecumoire* oder *Le Sopha* suchen.<sup>40</sup> Unabhängig von dieser Einteilung folgen Hinweise auf zeitgenössische Romanschriftsteller wie Jean Baptiste de Boyer, Marquis d'Argens, Alain-René Lesage oder Samuel Richardson.<sup>41</sup> Giovanni Boccaccio und Margarita von Navarra hätten zwar sehr amüsante Romane verfaßt, doch seien diese zu freizügig. Cervantes' *Don Quichotte* sei ebenso unverzichtbar wie François Rabelais' *Pantagruel* und *Gargantua*; die beiden letzteren Romane seien jedoch trotz der vorhandenen Kommentare schwer zugänglich und undurchsichtig.<sup>42</sup>

Obwohl mit "Poésie" überschrieben, wird in diesem Kapitel auch das Theater verhandelt. Den Auftakt bilden wiederum methodologische Werke zur Poesie von Aristoteles, François d'Aubignac, René Le Bossu und Jean Baptiste Dubos.<sup>43</sup> Für die Renaissance benennt Formey die Werke von Pierre de Ronsard, François de Malherbe und Guillaume du Bartas,<sup>44</sup> auch wenn sich diese Dichtung als wenig vollkommen präsentiere. Größeres Renommé spricht er den Werken von Clément Marot zu.<sup>45</sup> Unter den modernen Poeten nimmt Nicolas

---

<sup>40</sup> Claude Prosper Jolyot de Crébillon: *Le Sopha; conte moral*. Gaznah: Impr. du Sultan des Indes, l'an de l'hegire 1120 [i.e. 1743]; Ders.: *L'Ecumoire: Histoire japonaise*. Amsterdam, Leipzig 1743.

<sup>41</sup> Formey benennt keine Romantitel von d'Argens. Zu den bekanntesten zählen: Jean Baptiste de Boyer d'Argens: *Lettres juives, ou correspondance philosophique, historique, et critique, entre un juif voyageur à Paris et ses correspondants en divers endroits*. La Haye 1736; Ders.: *Lettres chinoises, ou correspondance philosophique, historique et critique entre un chinois voyageur à Paris et ses correspondants à la Chine, en Moscovie, en Perse et au Japon*. La Haye 1739–40; Alain René Lesage: *Le Diable boiteux*. Amsterdam: Desbordes 1708; Samuel Richardson: *Pamela ou la vertu récompensée*. traduit de l'anglois. en deux tomes. London 1741.

<sup>42</sup> Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra: *Histoire de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*. Francfort: Bassompierre 1750; François Rabelais: *Oeuvres: publiées sous le titre de faits et dits du Géant Gargantua et de son fils Pantagruel avec la prognostication Pantagrueline*. Paris 1732.

<sup>43</sup> Poétique d'Aristote, traduit en françois avec des remarques critiques sur tout l'ouvrage par André Dacier. Paris 1692; François Hédelin d'Aubignac: *Pratique du théâtre: ouvrage très nécessaire à ceux qui veulent s'appliquer à la composition des poèmes dramatiques, qui les recitent en public, ou qui prennent plaisir d'en voir les representations*. Amsterdam: Bernard 1715; René Le Bossu: *Traité du poème épique*. Paris 1675; Jean Baptiste Du Bos: *Réflexions critiques sur la Poesie et sur la Peinture*. Paris: Mariette 1740–46.

<sup>44</sup> Pierre de Ronsard: *Les oeuvres*. Paris 1578; François de Malherbe: *Les oeuvres de Malherbe*. Paris: Luyne 1659; Guillaume de Salluste du Bartas: *Oeuvres*. s.l. 1583.

<sup>45</sup> Clément Marot: *Oeuvres de Clement Marot, revues sur plusieurs manuscrits et sur plus de quarante éditions*. A la Haye 1731.

Boileau als *législateur* und Restaurator der Poesie den höchsten Rang ein.<sup>46</sup> Selbst die modernen Poeten hätten nicht das Recht, sich mit ihm auf eine Stufe zu stellen. Zu den größten zeitgenössischen französischen Poeten zählt Formey Voltaire, dessen Verdienst in der Modernisierung des epischen Poems bestehe.<sup>47</sup> Unter den poetischen Werken wie auch unter den Theaterstücken dominiert die französische Literatur. Die zeitgenössischen Dramatiker—daran läßt der Verfasser keinen Zweifel—würden an die Größen des Genres wie Corneille, Racine oder Molière nicht heranreichen, selbst wenn sie Crébillon oder Marivaux hießen.

Im Kapitel "Moral & Goût" finden vor allem pädagogische Schriften ihren Platz. Als das Werk, das beide Begriffe am besten vereinigen würde, wird der *Anti-Machiavel* von Friedrich II. angeführt.<sup>48</sup> Die Moral werde hier zum bestimmenden Element und das Bestreben, Machiaveli zu widerlegen zum Leitmotiv. Formeys Ratschläge zu moralischen Schriften sind umfangreicher als die Abhandlungen zu dem für das 18. Jahrhundert eminent wichtigen Begriff des Geschmacks. Zu letzterem Thema führt er lediglich Charles de Montesquieu, Jean-Baptiste Gresset und Jean-Pierre Crousaz als Referenzen an.<sup>49</sup>

Cicero und Seneca als die Vertreter der antiken werden gefolgt von den modernen Moralisten Jean de La Bruyère, Nicolas-Charles Trublet und François de La Rochefoucauld.<sup>50</sup> Die moralischen Werke des letzteren würden allerdings eine überzogene Darstellung der menschlichen Korruptheit vermitteln, die fast an die Zerstörung jeglicher Tugend grenze. Nicolas-Charles Trublet befindet sich in dieser illustren Gesellschaft dank der engen Freundschaft mit Formey. In diesem Kapitel wird auch die Lektüre der Moralischen Wochenschriften empfohlen, ihr englisches Vorbild, *The Spectator*, vor allem aber die französischen Nachahmungen werden aufgeführt: Marivaux' *Spectateur*

<sup>46</sup> Nicolas Boileau Despréaux: *L'Art poétique*. Genève 1716.

<sup>47</sup> Unter den verschiedenen Ausgaben der Werke Voltaires wird die Ausgabe von 1745 in La Haye hervorgehoben.

<sup>48</sup> [Friedrich II., König von Preußen], *Anti-Machiavel, ou essai de critique sur le prince de Machiavel*, publié par Mr. de Voltaire. A la Haye 1740.

<sup>49</sup> Charles de Montesquieu: *Le Temple de Gnide*. Paris 1726; Jean Pierre de Crousaz: *Traité du Beau, où l'on montre en quoi consiste ce que l'on nomme ainsi, par des exemples tirez de la plupart des Arts & des Sciences*. Amsterdam: L'Honoré & Chatelain 1724; Jean-Baptiste Gresset: *Discours sur l'Harmonie*. Paris: Le Clerc 1737.

<sup>50</sup> Jean de La Bruyère: *Les Caractères de Theophraste*. Nouv. éd. Bruxelles 1672; Nicolas-Charles Trublet: *Essais sur divers sujets de littérature et de morale*. Paris: Briasson 1737; François de La Rochefoucauld: *Reflexions, sentences et maximes morales*. Paris 1714.

*françois* (1721–1724), *Le Mentor moderne* (Justus van Effen, 1723) und *Le Babillard* (Armand de la Chapelle, 1724, 1735). Es wird auf ganz verschiedene Textsorten verwiesen, die moralische Instruktionen enthalten können, z.B. die imaginären Reisen von Jonathan Swifts *Gulliver* oder Utopien wie jene von Thomas Morus.<sup>51</sup> Für die Instruktion von Heranwachsenden schätzt Formey die Erziehungswerke von John Locke, Jean-Pierre Crousaz und François de Fénelon als besonders nützlich ein.<sup>52</sup> Im 17. Jahrhundert erlebte der Brief als literarische Gattung eine zuvor nicht gekannte Beliebtheit, an der Spitze standen die Briefe von Marie de Sévigné gefolgt von Jean-Louis de Balzac und Vincent Voiture.<sup>53</sup> Unter der Bezeichnung *Lettres* sei eine große Anzahl von Werken veröffentlicht worden, in denen sich *morale* und *goût* vereint finden. Blaise Pascals *Pensées* und die *Lettres provinciales* werden gleich zu Beginn erwähnt wie auch eines der Meisterwerke, die *Lettres persanes*.<sup>54</sup> Zahlreiche Hinweise erhalten die Leser zu der im 18. Jahrhundert aufkommenden Gattung des Briefromans. Formey räumt ein, daß in einigen Werken die Moral nicht sehr offensichtlich sei. Für die moralischen Wertsetzungen in den *Lettres portugaises* oder in den *Lettres de la Marquise de R\*\*\** von Crébillon möchte er sich keinesfalls verbürgen.<sup>55</sup>

Im Kapitel *Géographie & voyage* sind die wichtigsten Atlanten, Reiseberichte und heraldischen Werke versammelt. Als Auswahlkriterien für gute Reiseberichte werden der Anteil wissenschaftlich fundierten

---

<sup>51</sup> Jonathan Swift: *Voyages du Capitaine Lemmel Gulliver en divers pays éloignés*. La Haye: Gerard vander Poel, 1730; Thomas More: *Idée d'une république heureuse: ou l'utopie de Thomas Morus*. traduit en français par Mr. Nicolas Gueudeville. Amsterdam: Honore 1730.

<sup>52</sup> John Locke: *De l'éducation des enfants*; traduit par P. Coste. 4 éd. Amsterdam: Uttwerf 1733; Jean-Pierre Crousaz: *Traité de l'éducation des enfants*. La Haye: Vaillant & Prevost 1722; François de Fénelon: *De l'Education des filles*. Nouv. éd. Amsterdam: Le Cene 1733; Ders.: *Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse*. Paris: Barthélémy 1719.

<sup>53</sup> Marie de Rabutin-Chantal de Sévigné: *Recueil des lettres de Madame la Marquis de Sévigné à Madame la Comtesse de Grignan, sa fille*. Leide: Verbeek 1736; Jean-Louis G. de Balzac: *Lettres*. Paris: Maretté 1634; Vincent Voiture: *Les lettres de Monsieur de Voiture*. Amsterdam: Ravesteyn 1657.

<sup>54</sup> Blaise Pascal: *Pensées de M. Pascal sur la religion et sur quelques autres sujets: qui ont esté trouvées après sa mort parmi ses papiers*. 3 éd. Paris: Desprez 1671; Ders.: *Les provinciales ou lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte à un provincial*. Cologne 1657; Charles L. de Montesquieu: *Les lettres persanes*. Amsterdam 1721.

<sup>55</sup> [Gabriel Guilleragues], Marianna Alcoforado: *Lettres portugaises*. Paris: Barbin 1670; Claude Prosper Jolyot de Crébillon: *Lettres de la Marquise de M\*\*\* au comte de R\*\*\**. s.l. 1744; Ders.: *Les égarements du coeur et de l'esprit, ou mémoires de Mr. de Meilcour*. La Haye: Neaulme 1738.

Wissens und der Grad ihrer Glaubhaftigkeit angeführt. Die wichtigsten Reisenden finden sich nur namentlich erwähnt: Jean Baptiste Tavernier, Melchisédech Thevenot, Balthasar Monconys, Adam Olearius, Jean Chardin, Guillaume Dampier, Bemoît de Maillet, Thomas Shaw und Karl von Pöllnitz.<sup>56</sup>

### 3. Die zweite und dritte Auflage der *Conseils*

Da das anfänglich knapp 70 Seiten umfassende Werk bei den Lesern großen Zuspruch fand, gibt Formey zwei überarbeitete Neuauflagen (1750, 1755) heraus. Die dritte Auflage von 1755 war bereits auf 122 Seiten angewachsen. In der zweiten Edition der *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque* ist einiges neu, wenn auch der Plan, der ursprüngliche Grundstock empfohlener Bücher und der Aufbau gleich geblieben sind.<sup>57</sup> In einem vorangeschickten Avertissement sieht sich Formey gezwungen, Vorwürfe der Oberflächlichkeit und der Kompilation zurückzuweisen. Er betont, daß er kein Bibliothekar sei und seine Ratschläge einen privaten Charakter hätten. “Mais je ne voulais faire que ce que j’ai fait, c’est à dire, indiquer les meilleurs livres d’un usage à peu près universel, qui peuvent entrer dans un Cabinet.”<sup>58</sup>

Die Veränderungen und Präzisierungen, die Formey in den beiden Nachfolgeausgaben vornimmt, treten in den ersten Kapiteln zur Theologie und Philosophie am deutlichsten hervor. Die Ergänzungen aus dem “Supplement” der ersten Ausgabe finden sich seit der zweiten Ausgabe eingearbeitet. Neben Jean-Jacob Vernet werden stärker Schweizer protestantische Autoren mit ihren Werken aufgenommen,

<sup>56</sup> Jean Baptiste Tavernier: *Les six voyages de Jean Baptiste Tavernier en Turquie, en Perse et aux Indes*. Paris 1702; Melchisédech Thevenot: *Relations de divers voyages curieux*. Paris 1696; Balthasar Monconys: *Voyages de Mr. de Monconys divisé en V Tomes*. Paris: Pierre Deaulne 1695; Adam Olearius: *Voyages très curieux et très renommés faits en Moscovie*. Leide 1718; Jean Chardin: *Voyages du chevalier Chardin en Perse et autres lieux de l’Orient*. Amsterdam: La Comp 1735; Guillaume Dampier: *Nouveau voyage autour du monde*. Amsterdam: Marret 1711; Benoît de Maillet: *Description de l’Egypte*. Paris: Genneau et Rollin 1735; Thomas Shaw: *Voyages de Mr. Shaw dans plusieurs provinces de la Barbarie et du Levant*. La Haye 1743; Karl L. Baron von Pöllnitz: *Mémoires de Mr. le Baron de Pöllnitz: contenant les observations qu’il a faites dans ses voyages, et le caractère des personnes qui composent les principales cours de l’Europe*. 2. éd. Amsterdam, Londres: Hoguel 1735.

<sup>57</sup> Für die neue Auflage hat er einige Fehler der Erstausgabe korrigiert, einige Absätze hinzugefügt bzw. herausgenommen, vor allem aber wichtige Neuerscheinungen eingearbeitet.

<sup>58</sup> *Conseils* (1750), unpaginiert [S. 8].

so Johann Friedrich Stapfer mit einem theologischen Grundkurs oder Charles Bonnet mit dem *Traité d'Insectologie*.<sup>59</sup> Im Zusammenhang mit der Neuausgabe der *Histoire de la Réformation* von Isaac de Beausobre wird auf den wichtigen Berliner Theologen August Friedrich Wilhelm Sack verwiesen, der bei den Zeitgenossen Formeys mit seiner *Defense de la Foi chrétienne* auf lebhaftes Echo stieß.<sup>60</sup> Auch die in der Erstausgabe sehr vage gebliebene Ankündigung einer Geschichte der Päpste wird präzisiert: Das Werk des englischen Gelehrten Archibald Bower werde ins Französische übersetzt, so daß der Leser bald über den Wert selbst urteilen könne.<sup>61</sup>

Die überarbeiteten Ausgaben von 1750 und 1755 verfolgen den Anspruch, das protestantische Übergewicht zu relativieren und mehr in Paris erschienene Publikationen französischer Philosophen aufzunehmen. Etienne de Condillac wird neu aufgenommen und ist gleich mit drei Werken erwähnt.<sup>62</sup> Die ersten Bände von Buffons *Histoire naturelle* werden mit einem positiven Urteil empfohlen.<sup>63</sup> Der Leser bleibt ebenfalls über den Stand des Enzyklopädieunternehmens von d'Alembert und Diderot auf dem Laufenden. 1750 meldet Formey, daß sich die Übersetzung der *Encyclopédie de Chambers* im Druck befindet—mit einigen Zusätzen und Verbesserungen, so daß das Werk auf dem Weg zu einer wahrhaften Fundgrube sei.<sup>64</sup> Fünf Jahre später berichtet er, daß die ersten vier Bände trotz mancher Schwierigkeiten erschienen sind und daß das Werk einen neuen Grad der Perfektion erreicht habe—keine Rede mehr von einer “Übersetzung”, es erhält bereits die Attribute eines Jahrhundertwerkes.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Jean-Jacob Vernet: *Instruction chrétienne*. Neuveville 1751; Johann Friedrich Stapfer: *Anweisung zur christlichen Religion*. Zürich: Heidegger 1753; Charles Bonnet: *Traité d'Insectologie*. Tom. 1.2. Paris 1745.

<sup>60</sup> Isaac de Beausobre: *Histoire de la réformation, ou origine et progrès du Luthéranisme*. Berlin: F. de la Garde 1785–86. T. I–IV; August Friedrich Wilhelm Sack: *Defense de la Foi chrétienne*, traduit par un de ses amis. Avec une préface tirée d'une dissertation de feu Mr. Jordan. Berlin: Jasperd 1749.

<sup>61</sup> Archibald Bower: *The history of the Popes*. Third Edit. London 1750, Vol. 1–7; Ders.: *Histoire abrégée des quarante premiers évêques de Rome depuis St. Pierre jusqu'à Zozime / tirée de l'ouvrage anglois de Mr. Bower*. Londres [Selbstverl.].

<sup>62</sup> Etienne Bonnot de Condillac: *Traité des Systèmes: où l'on en démêle les inconveniens & les avantages*. La Haye 1749; *Essai sur l'Origine des connaissances humaines*. Amsterdam: Mortier 1746; Ders.: *Traité des Sensations*, à Mme la Ctesse de Vassé. Londres, Paris 1754. [in der *Conseils*-Ausgabe von 1755, S. 15].

<sup>63</sup> Jean Louis Leclerc de Buffon: *Histoire naturelle, générale & particulière avec la Description du Cabinet du Roi*. 2 éd. Paris 1750–1781.

<sup>64</sup> *Conseils* (1750), S. 18.

<sup>65</sup> *Conseils* (1755), S. 19.

Die literarischen Abteilungen "Romans" und "Poésie" unterlagen geringen Veränderungen. Der Abschnitt über Voltaire wird in der Ausgabe von 1755 erheblich gekürzt wie auch der zu d'Argens.<sup>66</sup> Das Kapitel "Morale & Goût" eröffnet in der 1755er Ausgabe nicht mehr mit einer Lobeshymne auf den *Anti-Machiavel* von Friedrich II., sondern mit dem kurzen Satz "*L'Anti-Machiavel* tient parmi les livres le même rang que son auteur occupe parmi les hommes" und rangiert an entlegenerer Stelle in diesem Kapitel.<sup>67</sup> Neu aufgenommen wurde das Werk von Charles Batteux über die Theorie des Schönen.<sup>68</sup> Eine wesentliche Ergänzung im letzten Kapitel zur Jurisprudenz stellt der Verweis auf Montesquieus *Esprit des lois* dar.<sup>69</sup>

Als Trublet die zweite Ausgabe der *Conseils* im Mai 1750 in den Händen hielt, machte er bereits in einem Brief an Formey verschiedene Verbesserungsvorschläge, die sich in der vierten, Pariser, Ausgabe teilweise berücksichtigt finden. Trublet empfiehlt Fontenelles *Digression* und warnt vor Pierre-François Desfontaines' *Observations*,<sup>70</sup> er kritisiert die Akzentsetzungen Formeys im Abschnitt *Lettres*: Die Briefromane des Marquis d'Argens seien nicht auf eine Stufe mit den *Lettres persanes* zu stellen, sie seien im Gegenteil doch sehr mittelmäßig. Die *Lettres d'une Péruvienne* hingegen sind unter die erst- nicht zweitklassigen Briefromane zu zählen.<sup>71</sup>

Auch unter den Käufern der *Conseils* befanden sich einige Leser, die mit der Publikation unzufrieden waren, weil wichtige Gebiete ihrer Meinung nach ausgelassen worden sind:

<sup>66</sup> *Conseils* (1755), S. 52; S. 45. Bei d'Argens wurde der Satz "On y trouve tout le goût, tout le style & toute la politesse, qui peuvent rendre de telles compositions propres au but pour lequel elles sont destinées." in der zweiten Ausgabe (1750, S. 41) weggelassen.

<sup>67</sup> *Conseils* (1755), S. 65.

<sup>68</sup> Charles Batteux: *Les Beaux-arts réduits à un même principe*. Paris: Durand 1746. Trublet fand übrigens, daß Formey dieses Werk überbewertete. Trublet an Formey, 16. Mai 1750. In: *Correspondance passive de Formey*. Antoine-Claude Briasson et Nicolas-Charles-Joseph Trublet. *Lettres adressées à Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey* (1739–1770). Textes édités par Martin Fontius, Rolf Geissler et Jens Häsel. Paris, Genève 1996, S. 133.

<sup>69</sup> Charles L. de Montesquieu: *Esprit des lois*. Genève: Barillot 1749.

<sup>70</sup> Bernard Le Bouvier de Fontenelle: *Poésies pastorales . . . avec un Traité sur la nature de l'églogue et une digression sur les anciens et les modernes*. Paris: Guérout 1688; Pierre-François Guyot Desfontaines, *Observations sur les écrits modernes*. Paris: Chaubert 1735–43.

<sup>71</sup> Trublet an Formey, 16. Mai 1750. In: *Correspondance passive de Formey . . .* S. 130–133. (Anm. 68). Mme de Grafigny: *Lettres d'une Péruvienne*. Paris 1747.



C'est depuis quelques jours que j'ai m'acheté [sic!] vos *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque* etc., troisième édition. Je ne doutais pas, Monsieur, que vous avez par cela satisfait peut-être tout le monde, mais permettez, [...] que je n'en suis pas. [...] cette science [...] est si nécessaire [...]: le savoir des finances et de camérale [...].<sup>72</sup>

Der Verfasser, ein deutscher Kaufmann aus Berlin, hat in diesem Brief an Formey bibliographische Hinweise für ein zusätzliches Kapitel über Finanzen und Kameralismus angefügt. In der fünften, offensichtlich letzten und hier nicht weiter untersuchten Ausgabe der *Conseils* von 1764 wird ein sechzehnseitiges Kapitel über den Handel eingefügt.<sup>73</sup>

Bei aller Kritik der Leser bestand das Verdienst der *Conseils* unter anderem auch in ihrer Eignung als Einführung in verschiedene Wissensgebiete. So wurden neue Ausgaben den jeweiligen Bedürfnissen angeglichen:

C'est la cinquième édition qu'on fait de celle-ci; nous nous flattons qu'elle ne sera pas moins favorablement reçue que les précédentes. On l'a non seulement corrigée d'un nombre de fautes, indiqué les Editions les plus modernes des Ouvrages que l'auteur a recommandés [...]. Mais l'augmentation qui nous semble la plus importante c'est l'Article qu'on a ajouté des livres qui traitent du commerce, qui est d'un homme du metier [...].<sup>74</sup>

#### 4. Die Pariser Ausgabe der *Conseils* von 1756

Die Bedürfnisse des Pariser Publikums wollte der Pariser Verleger Antoine-Claude Briasson berücksichtigen, als er die vierte Ausgabe der *Conseils* vorbereitete. Wenn es nach Briasson gegangen wäre, hätte Formey von der Pariser Ausgabe nie etwas erfahren, doch Nicolas Trublet hatte seinen Berliner Freund gerade rechtzeitig informiert,

<sup>72</sup> F. Heyden an Formey, 19. Dezember 1755, NL Formey, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.

<sup>73</sup> Bruzen de la Martinière: Introduction générale aux sciences, avec les Conseils pour former une Bibliothèque peu nombreuse mais choisie par Mr. Formey. Cinquième édition, corrigée et augmentée d'un Article des livres de Commerce. A Amsterdam chez J. H. Schneider 1764. Es ist allerdings wenig wahrscheinlich, daß diese Ausführungen auf den Kaufmann Heyden zurückgehen. Den tatsächlichen Anteil Formeys an dieser bei Schneider in Amsterdam publizierten Ausgabe konnte ich nicht feststellen.

<sup>74</sup> Bruzen de la Martinière: Avertissement, in: Ders.: Introduction générale aux sciences . . . (Anm. 73), S. V–VI.

damit dieser bei Briasson seine Ansprüche geltend machen konnte. Bereits 1751 hatte Briasson die Idee geäußert, eine Ausgabe der *Conseils* für das französische Publikum vorbereiten zu wollen.<sup>75</sup> Formey schien darauf nicht eingegangen zu sein. Als das Thema vier Jahre später—eher unfreiwillig—wieder zur Sprache kam, blieb Briasson keine andere Wahl, als seine Betrügerei zuzugeben:

J'ai eu intention de vous faire une petite espièglerie; mais je suis décelé près de vous et vous ne le savez pas encore. Voici le fait. J'ai tiré plusieurs exemplaires de vos *Conseils*; bien des gens en ont pris et d'autres en voudraient, mais votre livre n'est pas pour notre France. Il parle beaucoup de livres étrangers, d'autres qui sont renouvelés; d'autres d'une confession différente de la nôtre; enfin il m'a semblé qu'il ne pourrait que mieux se débiter s'il était tourné à l'usage de nos Français. J'ai encore usé d'un autre motif, ma librairie m'est chère et j'ai cité beaucoup de mes livres sans affection mais toujours dans ce but de les indiquer en suivant votre plan et votre ton.<sup>76</sup>

Briasson bat Formey, auf dem Titelblatt der Pariser Ausgabe von 1756 Berlin als Erscheinungsort zu belassen und, wenn möglich, den Verlegern Haude und Spener nichts mitzuteilen.

Vergleicht man nun die Briasson-Ausgabe von 1756 mit den drei Berliner Ausgaben, so stellt man bei einem genauen Textvergleich fest, daß Briasson das Kapitel "Écriture sainte, théologie et histoire ecclésiastique" grundlegend verändert hat, die anderen Kapitel blieben im Wesentlichen erhalten. Das wird nicht zuletzt auf den Einfluß Trublets zurückzuführen sein, über den Formey ein gewisses Mitspracherecht ausüben konnte. Trublet unterrichtete Formey über den geplanten Nachdruck und die Veränderungen, die er teilweise selbst vornahm:

J'ai parcouru la nouvelle édition de vos *Conseils etc.* Je l'ai remise à M. Briasson; j'en ai conféré deux fois avec lui. Sa réimpression commencée va être suspendue pour quelques jours, pendant lesquels je ferai quelques petits changements, corrections, et additions à votre ouvrage, tant pour le fond des choses que pour le style souvent un peu trop négligé. Je ne sais pas, si je m'accorderai en tout avec M. Briasson, parce que j'aperçois aisément que son but principal en réimprimant vos *Conseils*, est de procurer le débit de plusieurs livres de sa boutique et de celles de quelques-uns de ses confrères.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Briasson an Formey, 28. Mai 1751, in: Correspondance passive de Formey . . . S. 67 (Anm. 68).

<sup>76</sup> Briasson an Formey, 6. Mai 1755, in: Correspondance passive de Formey . . . S. 83 (Anm. 68).

<sup>77</sup> Trublet an Formey, 8. Juni 1755, in: Correspondance passive de Formey . . . S. 150 (Anm. 68).

Eine Veränderung, die Briasson vorgenommen hatte, war die Herausgabe der *Conseils* gemeinsam mit der *Introduction générale à l'étude des sciences* von La Martinière.<sup>78</sup> Der Pariser Verleger behält zwar den Aufbau der Kapitel und den Text bei, ersetzt aber die angezeigten Titel. Im ersten Kapitel zur Theologie werden andere Bibelausgaben als verbindlich dargestellt. Nicht mehr David Martin, Samuel Desmarets, Jacques Lenfant und Isaac de Beausobre sind die Referenzen, sondern das Spektrum wird verengt auf Le Maistre de Sacy, Denis Amelote und Dominique Bouhours.<sup>79</sup> Die längere Passage zu Johann Gustav Reinbeck wird komplett gestrichen, auch die Berliner Pastoren Sack und Beausobre spart Briasson aus. Andere protestantische Autoren behalten hingegen auch in der Pariser Ausgabe ihren Platz. Briasson kürzt immerhin eine Seite mit Literaturhinweisen zur Geschichte der Reformation. Im Gegenzug wird den Werken von Claude Fleury größere Bedeutung beigemessen.<sup>80</sup>

Der Aufbau des Kapitels "Histoire" wird in der Pariser Ausgabe zwar beibehalten, doch überwiegen hier die Zusätze und nicht, wie im Kapitel zur Religion, die Kürzungen. Formeys Kritik an Guillaume Raynal wird zwar übernommen, aber abgeschwächt durch einen positiven Zusatz. Auch der bei Formey anklingende, weniger positive Einfluß Raynals auf den *Mercure de France* wird nicht übernommen.<sup>81</sup> Die Ausführungen zu Maupertuis im Kapitel *Philosophie* werden gekürzt. Grundsätzlich werden Verweise auf deutschsprachige Werke wie das *Dictionnaire* von Walch oder die deutsche Ausgabe der Wolffschen Werke weggelassen. An mehreren Stellen aktualisiert Briasson die zwischenzeitlich erschienene Bandanzahl (z.B. bei Fortsetzungswerken) oder präzisiert die in Formeys Aufstellung unbenannt gebliebenen Autoren (z.B. das *Dictionnaire mythologique* von Abbé de Clautre). Im Kapitel "Belles-Lettres" wird die Etymologie als neuer Bereich mit

<sup>78</sup> Bruzen de la Martinière: *Introduction générale à l'étude des sciences et des Belles-Lettres, en faveur des personnes qui ne savent que le françois*. [Paris: Briasson 1756], im Anschluß an die 1756er Ausgabe der *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque peu nombreuse, mais choisie*. Berlin: Haude et Spener [tatsächlich: Paris: Briasson] 1756.

<sup>79</sup> Le Maistre de Sacy: *La Sainte Bible, traduit en françois sur la Vulgate avec des courtes notes pour l'intelligence de la Lettre*. Bruxelles: Fr. Foppens 1702; Denis Amelote: *Le Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Muguet 1683; Dominique Bouhours: *Pensées chrétiennes pour tous les jours du mois*. Bruxelles: Foppens 1694.

<sup>80</sup> Claude Fleury: *Histoire ecclésiastique*. Bruxelles 1716; Ders.: *Les moeurs des israelites*. Bruxelles 1712.

<sup>81</sup> *Conseils* (1756), S. 51. Formey hatte sich geäußert: "il faut avouer que l'Abbé Raynal l'avoit un peu négligé". *Conseils* (1755), S. 33.

dem *Dictionnaire étymologique* von Gilles Ménage aufgenommen.<sup>82</sup> Die Literatur zur *Question des Anciens et Modernes* wird um die *Digression* von Fontenelle ergänzt.<sup>83</sup> Der Ruf des *Mercure historique* wird im Kapitel "Journaux" zurechtgerückt:

Edition von 1755:

Le *Mercure historique* est une récapitulation des Gazettes. Au reste, il paroît & disparaît continuellement une foule d' Ecrits périodiques et tout genre.<sup>84</sup>

Edition von 1756:

Le *Mercure Historique* n'est presque qu'une récapitulation des Gazettes. Mais on y trouve une suite précieuse des pièces de politique depuis quatre-vingts ans, & on ne les trouve que dans ce seul recueil, ce qui rend ce livre considérable. D'autre part il paroît et disparaît continuellement une foule d'écrits périodiques . . .<sup>85</sup>

Dieser Textvergleich zeigt deutlich, wie Briasson in die Vorlage eingriff: größtenteils zwar behutsam, doch um gezielt die Aussage zu verändern.

Im Kapitel "Poésie" ist es vor allem die bei Formey vertretene Breite der Renaissance-Autoren, die Briasson opfert. Ronsard, Malherbe, Desportes, Du Bartas, Theophile, St. Amant, Racan sowie Régniers und Marot fanden Aufnahme bei Formey—bei Briasson stehen an dieser Stelle nur Malherbe, Régnier und Marot.

Das Kapitel "Eloquence" verdeutlicht die Aufmerksamkeit Trublets. Dieser hat nämlich nicht nur darauf geachtet, daß Briasson die neue *Conseils*-Ausgabe zu sehr für eigene Werbezwecke nutzt, sondern er hat auch seinen eigenen Schriften zu einer größeren Anerkennung verholfen. Formey hatte die Werke des Pariser Korrespondenzpartners und Freund in diesem Kapitel nicht erwähnt, in der Pariser Variante des Kapitels kommen seine Werke keinesfalls zu kurz.<sup>86</sup>

Formey (oder Briasson im Namen Formeys) artikuliert resümierend das Bewußtsein einer Urteilsentwicklung. Er habe in dieser Ausgabe Korrekturen an seinen bisherigen Urteilen vorgenommen und viel-

<sup>82</sup> Gilles Ménage: *Dictionnaire étymologique, ou Origines de la langue française*. Paris: Briasson 1750. (1. Auflage, Paris: J. Anisson 1694).

<sup>83</sup> Vgl. Anm. 70.

<sup>84</sup> *Conseils* (1755), S. 33.

<sup>85</sup> *Conseils* (1756), S. 43.

<sup>86</sup> Nicolas-Charles Trublet: *Panegyrique des Saints, suivis des Réflexions sur l'Eloquence en général, et sur celle de la chaire en particulier*. 2. éd. Paris 1764.

leicht zuwenig Vorsicht im Hinblick auf noch lebende Schriftsteller walten lassen. Ihm bliebe jedoch die Hoffnung, daß sich die genannten Autoren nicht durch die Kritik verletzt, sondern vielmehr durch die Empfehlung geschmeichelt fühlen.<sup>87</sup>

### 5. Fazit

Mehrere Schlußfolgerungen, die sich aus der Analyse der verschiedenen Ausgaben der *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque* ziehen lassen, können die Antwort auf die eingangs gestellte Frage nach der Festschreibung eines verbindlichen Wissenskanons geben: Formey handelte mit dem Anspruch, der bereits von Münchow intendiert und formuliert worden war, verbindliche Lektürecempfehlungen zusammenzustellen. Die Auswahl, die mit dem Bemühen um Repräsentativität getroffen wurde, spiegelte das notwendige Wert- und Urteilsbewußtsein wieder. Für den *Prozeß* der Kanonisierung, dem unser vordergründiges Interesse galt, stellt dieser Objektivitätsanspruch die Ausgangsbasis dar. Die Benennung, das Zitat, ist Erinnerung und damit ein Plädoyer für den Verbleib eines Textes im kollektiven Bewußtsein. Die Auswahlmechanismen finden im Hinblick auf das Publikum statt; das anvisierte Lesepublikum ist im Kanon eingeschrieben. Das wurde bei der Analyse der Pariser Ausgabe offensichtlich. Die Neubearbeitung von Briasson machte darüber hinaus deutlich, welche Faktoren ebenfalls Einfluß auf die Bildung eines verbindlichen Kanons haben können: verlegerisches Eigeninteresse und persönliche Eitelkeiten.

Durch den Textvergleich konnte die Stabilität eines vorhandenen Wissenspotentials nachgewiesen werden. Das Spektrum der zum Kauf empfohlenen Bücher bleibt in den Formeyschen Ausgaben homogen. Der skizzierte Pool von Referenztexten gehorcht zwar einer vorrangig protestantischen Bildungsauffassung, setzt jedoch lediglich in den theologischen, historischen und philosophischen Disziplinen stärkere Akzente in dieser Richtung. In den Kapiteln "Écriture sainte" und "Philosophie" ist ein überdurchschnittlich hoher Anteil protestantischer, kanonischer Texte aus dem hugenottischen *Refuge* vertreten. In den literarischen Domänen wie dem Roman, der Poesie oder dem Theater sind französische Autoren fest etabliert. Die Ratschläge zum Aufbau einer Privatbibliothek vermitteln in erster Linie den Wissens-

---

<sup>87</sup> *Conseils* (1756), S. 100–101.

horizont der etablierten hugenottischen Elite in der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts, blenden die zeitgenössische deutsche Wissenschaftsproduktion jedoch nicht aus. In den von Formey zusammengestellten Ausgaben haben deutsche Autoren wie Reinbeck, Wolff oder Pufendorf einen festen, wenn auch nicht repräsentativen Platz. Dieser Wissenskanon veränderte sich auch durch die Übernahme der Edition durch Briasson nicht wesentlich. Feststellbar waren Akzentverschiebungen, aber keine wesentlichen bzw. neuartigen Kanones.

Formeys Ratgeber für den Aufbau einer Privatbibliothek reflektiert den sozialen Bedarf an der Orientierung im Umgang mit Büchern, in der Auswahl der Lektüre und somit den implizit gewachsenen Bildungsanspruch. So werden keine geschlechterspezifischen Unterscheidungen vorgenommen: Die "Dame" ist hier gleichermaßen angesprochen wie der "Herr". Wissen und Bildung "nur für den Herrn" bzw. "nur für die Dame" gibt es bei Formey nicht. Lektüre gewinnt eine soziale Bildungsfunktion und kann nicht mehr ausschließlich dem persönlichen Geschmack überlassen werden. Formeys *Conseils pour former une bibliothèque* verdeutlichen das Ziel einer universalen Menschenbildung trotz des Schwergewichtes auf den schöngeistigen Wissensgebieten.\*

---

\* Dieser Beitrag ist im Rahmen des Forschungsprojekts "Franzosen in Berlin" am Forschungszentrum für Europäische Aufklärung (Potsdam) entstanden.

THE HUGUENOT CLERISY IN THE UNITED PROVINCES:  
ASPECTS OF HUGUENOT INFLUENCE ON DUTCH  
INTELLECTUAL LIFE AFTER THE REVOCATION\*

Joris van Eijnatten

Estimates of the number of Huguenot refugees settling in the Netherlands around 1685 have varied from 35,000 to as many as 90,000; the number was in any case substantial. The new immigrants were initially welcomed with warmth for a variety of reasons: the Republic's traditional role as a sanctuary for persecuted Protestants, the shared Calvinist faith, the anti-French politics of the stadholder-king William III, and the rather wistful hope that the importation of Huguenot know-how and capital would boost a lagging economy.<sup>1</sup> If the unprecedented number of immigrants soon enough led to a decline in the cordiality of the reception, it remains true that around 1700 a disproportionately large section of the Huguenot diaspora could be found in the Dutch Republic.

The Dutch contingent of Huguenots was not a uniform group. Their professions ranged from artisan to academic, and they brought with them a variety of skills and abilities. They joined a society that in some respects had entered into a decline, but which was nonetheless advanced, economically and intellectually. Berlin, in 1670, had a population of 12,000; the population of Amsterdam in that year was almost twenty times as large. When the Edict of Nantes was revoked, the Dutch Republic had been a powerful and thriving state,

---

\* For the sake of brevity, the titles of early modern Dutch translations of Huguenot writings mentioned in this article have been omitted; these translations are referred to only by their date of publication.

<sup>1</sup> Hans Bots and René Bastiaanse: *Die Hugenotten und die niederländische Generalstaaten*, in: *Die Hugenotten 1685–1985*, ed. Rudolf von Thadden and Michelle Magdelaine. München: Verlag C. H. Beck 1985, pp. 55–72. Hubert P. H. Nusteling: *The Netherlands and the Huguenot émigrés*, in: *La Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes et les Provinces-Unies—1685—The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the Dutch Republic*, ed. Hans Bots and Guillaume H. M. Posthumus Meyjes. Amsterdam, Maarssen: APA—Holland University Press 1986, pp. 17–34. See also M.Ch. Weiss: *Histoire des réfugiés protestants de France depuis la révocation de l'Édit de Nantes jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris: Charpentier 1853, vol. II, pp. 1–172.

and a hot-bed of intellectual life, for more than half a century—this was still the Netherlands of Hugo Grotius, Simon Episcopius, Baruch Spinoza, Balthasar Bekker, Gerard Noodt, Johan and Pieter de la Court, and so on. By contrast, Brandenburg was a backward principality far away from the economic and cultural hub of north-western Europe. Unlike ambitious German Electors eager to have their subjects participate in European culture, the Dutch had no particular reason to welcome the *littérateurs* and intellectuals among the Huguenots. Though the first Huguenot wave of the late 1500s and early 1600s had contributed substantially to the growth of Dutch prosperity and culture, by 1685 Dutch society was advanced enough to be able to do without a new economic and cultural injection.

What, however, was the significance of the later Huguenots to domestic Dutch intellectual life, given the fact that many post-Revocation French Protestants did make their way, in print and in the flesh, to the Netherlands? The question was first posed, in a general way, by the nineteenth-century Dutch man of letters and evangelical Hendrik Jacob Koenen (1809–1874). His *History of the settlement and the influence of French refugees in the Netherlands*, published in 1846, marks the beginning of modern Dutch history-writing concerning the Huguenots.<sup>2</sup> In this contribution I shall focus, not on the role of ‘Dutch’ Huguenots in the international networks of publishers, journalists and scholars—a topic which already has received some attention<sup>3</sup>—but on the influence of Huguenots on domestic Dutch intellectual life, and in particular on the development of a more ‘latitudinarian’ or ‘liberal’ intellectual climate in the United Provinces. In the sections that follow, I shall first briefly discuss, by way of example and introduction, the Swiss-Dutch Huguenot Jean Barbeyrac, taking as point of departure an address he held in 1721. Subsequently I shall address the wider issue of the influence exerted by post-Revocation Huguenots (that is, those Huguenots who left France *after* the Revocation) on Dutch intellectual life.

---

<sup>2</sup> Hendrik J. Koenen: *Geschiedenis van de vestiging en den invloed der Fransche vluchtelingen in Nederland*. Leiden: S. and J. Luchtmans 1846.

<sup>3</sup> A classic article is G. C. Gibbs: *Some Intellectual and Political Influences of the Huguenot Emigrés in the United Provinces, c. 1680–1730*, in: *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 90 (1975), pp. 255–287.



1. *Jean Barbeyrac as a Latitudinarian*

Born at Béziers in the Languedoc, Jean Barbeyrac (1674–1744) fled to Switzerland when he was eleven years old. After studying Greek, Hebrew, philosophy and theology at Lausanne, he came to Berlin via Geneva and Frankfurt an der Oder. In 1697 the Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick III, appointed him at the Gymnasium as a teacher of ancient languages. Frustrated in his attempt to become a minister of the French church in Berlin, he turned to the study of natural law, and worked on the translations of Samuel Pufendorf that made him famous. In 1710, Barbeyrac returned to Lausanne to become professor of law and history. He exchanged this post in 1717 for a professorship in public and private law at Groningen in the Dutch Republic, where he would teach law for almost three decades.

Only four years after his arrival in the Netherlands, at the conclusion of his term as university rector, Barbeyrac held a remarkable address, *De magistratu, forte peccante, e pulpitis sacris non traducendo*.<sup>4</sup> The address questioned the lawfulness of denouncing magistrates from the pulpit. Barbeyrac's message was absolutely clear. No clergyman, he claimed, has the right to publicly criticize the magistrate, for any reason whatsoever. A minister of the church has the same obligation as any other citizen. Public criticism of the magistracy leads to chaos and rebellion, all the more so when the critics are clergymen, who usually have a profound influence on the common people. Barbeyrac's address amounted to a critique of what he considered the clergy's inveterate tendency to unlawfully establish their own independent jurisdiction. In refuting the traditional orthodox claim that the 'public' or 'dominant' church should have a substantial degree of ecclesiastical independence, Barbeyrac defended a common latitudinarian position.

Huguenots like Barbeyrac played a prominent role in mediating and disseminating the ideas that went into the making of latitudinarianism. The latter term refers to the activities of certain academics, clergymen, jurists and other writers of early eighteenth-century

---

<sup>4</sup> Joris van Eijnatten: Swiss Anticlericalism in the United Provinces. Jean Barbeyrac's *Oratio de Magistratu, Forte Peccante, e Pulpitis Sacris non Traducendo* (1721), in: *La formazione storica della alterità. Studi di storia della tolleranza nell'età moderna offerti a Antonio Rotondò*, ed. Henri Méchoulan et al. Florence: Olschki 2001, vol. 3, pp. 861–886.

Protestant Europe who attempted to develop and establish a religious outlook that was able to, and eventually did, replace the orthodox systems of the confessional era. Latitudinarians—Barbeyrac, in his 1721 address, is a case in point—favoured a close alliance between church and state, and believed that the secular powers should control this alliance to ensure a sufficient measure of civil, and often also ecclesiastical, toleration. The latitudinarian outlook offered a vision of a comprehensive Christian society that incorporated or tolerated variations in doctrine and religious practice. Latitudinarianism took root institutionally in England after the Glorious Revolution, especially among those who sympathized with Low Church Whigs; in Switzerland, where it led to the abolition of the *Formula consensus*; in Brandenburg-Prussia, which evinced royal interest in *Unionsbestrebungen*; and in other German states, such as Württemberg, which had a contingent of latitudinarian divines at Tübingen, as well as Hanover and Brunswick.<sup>5</sup>

The claims of Barbeyrac's address were neither unique nor original. They were the expression of an anticlerical tradition that had surfaced time and again among Protestant writers who resented the orthodox clergy's supervision of 'dominant' churches. Contemporaries of Barbeyrac, ranging from Pierre Bayle and Christian Thomasius to Matthew Tindal, made exactly the same point—as Barbeyrac himself well knew, since he quoted many of them in the numerous footnotes to his address. These authorities generally pointed out that the clergy should not be permitted to establish a jurisdiction separate from that of the state, and that they should act and behave as all other subjects of the commonwealth are expected to act and behave.

Barbeyrac's 1721 address immediately attracted attention. It appeared independently in Latin (1721), Dutch (1722, 1724), and German (1722), while Latin, French, and Dutch editions with supplementary footnotes were later reissued in conjunction with other writings by Barbeyrac. It would probably not be far off the mark to claim that most Dutch law students—many of whom would later follow a career as a magistrate—were quite familiar with Barbeyrac's views on toleration and the state. In the course of the eighteenth century refer-

---

<sup>5</sup> The influence of these latitudinarians on intellectual life in the Dutch Republic is discussed at length in Joris van Eijnatten: *Liberty and Concord in the United Provinces. Religious Toleration and the Public in the Eighteenth-Century Netherlands*. Leiden etc.: Brill 2002 (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History).

ences to the address surfaced time and again, in poems, moral weeklies, sermons, and so on. It is not difficult to explain the Dutch esteem for Barbeyrac. He was, in the first place, an academic of international standing. Although he worked at Groningen for almost thirty years, he never became a Dutchman at heart. He never learnt to speak Dutch properly and found certain Dutch habits hard to swallow: the coffee houses, the tobacco, the beer, the protracted social calls, and the endless academic bickering over precedence during official events.<sup>6</sup> His contacts throughout the Republic of Letters go without speaking, and the extent of his collaboration in critical francophone periodicals such as the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée* is well known.<sup>7</sup>

An academic address implicitly carried the sanction of the magistracy. Barbeyrac, indeed, upheld close relations with the political elite in Groningen. His position in this regard is paradoxical; it is also characteristic of most if not all latitudinarian writers. His was a libertarian cause, but he could not do without authority; he could proclaim his ideals only with magisterial support, and within the limits accorded by the magistracy. Because of the support lent to him by the Groningen magistrates, Barbeyrac was able to disseminate latitudinarian ideas with some impunity. Yet even a luminary such as he would not have been allowed to freely criticize accepted orthodox doctrine. In 1773, when his later successor at the Groningen law faculty, a notorious fan of Christian Thomasius's ideas on church government, used naturalistic arguments to undermine traditional doctrine, the Calvinist clergy lobbied successfully to relieve him of his professorship.<sup>8</sup> It is no less telling that Barbeyrac himself expressed his admiration for the English Unitarian James Foster only in private

---

<sup>6</sup> M. Bakker et al.: *Hugenoten in Groningen. Franse vluchtelingen tussen 1680 en 1720*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, Bouma's Boekhuis 1985, p. 163.

<sup>7</sup> Antonio Rotondò: *Stampa periodica olandese e opinione pubblica europea nel settecento. La "Bibliothèque Raisonnée" (1728-1753)*, in: *Rivista Storica Italiana* CX (1998), pp. 166-221.

<sup>8</sup> J. Lindeboom: *Frederik Adolf van der Marck. Een achttiende-eeuwsch leeraar van het natuurrecht*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1947. Prior to Barbeyrac's arrival, the Swiss mathematician Johann Bernoulli (1667-1748), who was already something of a luminary when he held the chair at Groningen between 1695 and 1705, was similarly embroiled in a conflict with the theological faculty. He was requested to return to Groningen in 1717, when the university offered him a substantial salary, but declined. See G. Sierksma: *Johann Bernoulli (1667-1748). Een Zwitsers wiskundige bekneld tussen Stad en Ommelanden*, in: 'Om niet aan onwetendheid en barbarij te bezwijken.' *Groningse geleerden 1614-1989*, ed. G. A. van Gemert, J. Schuler tot Peursum-Meijer, A. J. Vanderjagt. Hilversum, Verloren 1989, pp. 65-82.

letters and in anonymous reviews in the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*. When a Dutch Mennonite pastor, accused of Unitarianism in the early 1740s, was besieged by the Groningen theological faculty, Barbeyrac's silence in the affair was, to put it mildly, conspicuous.<sup>9</sup>

Barbeyrac, despite his objections to subscribing to the Swiss *formula consensus*, was appointed at a university which required him to formally append his signature to the orthodox Calvinist *Canones* of Dort. He kept a low profile, and did not further develop the anti-clerical views he had expressed in 1721 by applying them directly to the Dutch Reformed church—the official, so-called ‘public’ church of the United Provinces. In fact, Barbeyrac was actually regarded by the Dutch Calvinist clergy as a supporter of the public church, so much so that in 1745, a year after his death, a leading proponent of Calvinist orthodoxy quoted him at length in an academic address on the limits of religious toleration.<sup>10</sup> If the Groningen magistrates needed Barbeyrac to boost the reputation of their languishing university, and if some of them might have agreed in private with his views on church government and the status of formularies, they nevertheless expected Barbeyrac to comply with the rules applicable to all Dutch academics. Barbeyrac's message concerning toleration was ambiguous; in the Dutch context, his work could be, and was, interpreted in various ways.<sup>11</sup>

The case of Jean Barbeyrac appears, therefore, to provide us with three working hypotheses regarding the influence of latitudinarian Huguenots on Dutch intellectual life. First, such influence was qualified or constrained by the requirement of conformity to orthodoxy, whether through inward conviction or mere outward display. Second, deviations from the norm were possible only when the magistracy condoned them in public (which they did not), or when they were discussed among the political and intellectual élite in private. Third, any influence beyond the elite inner circles of politics and francophone scholarship involved a process of adjustment to the exi-

---

<sup>9</sup> Joris van Eijnatten: *Mutua Christianorum tolerantia. Irenicism and toleration in the Netherlands: The Stinstra affair 1740–1745* Florence: Olschki 1998 (Studi e testi per la storia della tolleranza in Europa nei secoli XVI–XVIII 2).

<sup>10</sup> This was Joan van den Honert; for his address, see Van Eijnatten: *Mutua Christianorum tolerantia*, pp. 281–314.

<sup>11</sup> Joris van Eijnatten: Gerard Noodt's standing in the eighteenth-century Dutch debate on religious freedom, in: *Dutch Review of Church History* 79/1 (1999), pp. 74–98.

gencies of Dutch society on the part of Huguenot refugees. These working hypotheses will be reviewed in the sections to come from the point of view of the university, the church, the press, and the Dutch and Huguenot clerisy; we shall also take a brief look at the Dutch reception of writings stemming from the Berlin *Refuge*.

## 2. *Academic Institutions*

Barbeyrac owed his appointment to his excellent reputation as a scholar, not to the fact that he was a Huguenot. The university of Groningen did not maintain a specific policy to attract homeless Huguenot intellectuals; its priority was to boost its academic reputation.<sup>12</sup> In the first three decades following the Revocation, only one Huguenot was appointed to a professorship. This was the theologian and philologist Jacques Gousset (1635–1704), a first generation exile who had been obliged to leave his children as well as his library behind in Poitiers. Appointed at Groningen in 1691, Gousset symbolized the intellectual stagnation of the university during the second half of the seventeenth century. In contrast to the later Arabists at the university of Leiden (above all Albert Schultens), Gousset believed that Hebrew was the original, divine language of Revelation, a view he defended with such tenacity that it became known as ‘Goussetisme’. The problems at Groningen were mainly caused by a longlasting political conflict between Groningen town and Groningen province. Not before 1717 was the university able to appoint a substantial number of professors—five in all, three of whom happened to be Huguenots. Apart from Barbeyrac, these were Michel Rossal († 1744), who taught Greek,<sup>13</sup> and Pierre de Toullieu (1669–1734),

---

<sup>12</sup> The same applies to Franeker university; having entered into a decline, the Franeker curators in 1741 attempted to obtain Barbeyrac, who turned down the offer. It is not clear on which conditions he was asked to come to Franeker; all we know is that he was offered a ‘suitable salary’. Johann Gottlieb Heineccius, who had been professor before at Franeker but now held a position at Halle, had been offered the very impressive salary of 2,500 guilders in 1740, whereas the less Dutchman Herman Cannegieter had been offered only 1,000 guilders. In the end, in 1741 the German Christian Heinrich Trotz was appointed as law professor at Franeker on a salary of 1,000 guilders (increased to 1,500 in 1743). See W. B. S. Boeles: *Friesland's Hoogeschool en het Rijks Atheneum te Franeker*. Leeuwarden: H. Kuipers 1878–1879, II, pp. 459–461.

<sup>13</sup> Rossal had been made doctor in philosophy honoris causa at Franeker in 1705;

a professor of law.<sup>14</sup> In addition, a dancing master as well as a fencing master of French extraction were appointed.<sup>15</sup> Huguenot intellectuals and tutors were evidently still readily available on the academic market thirty years after the Revocation. They profited from the fact that the various Dutch provinces not only defended with a passion the principle of provincial autonomy, but also vied with each other for glory; hence the relatively high concentration of academies, and the consequent shortage in academics.

Barbeyrac was the only Huguenot academic of international renown to occupy an established position at a Dutch university. At the Rotterdam *Athenaeum Illustré*, a minor educational institution, the controversial Pierre Bayle had been deprived of his professorship in 1693. Prior to the Revocation, in 1684, Bayle had been offered the chair in philosophy at the university of Franeker; one wonders what would have become of him if he had accepted.<sup>16</sup> Jean le Clerc's collaborator and nephew Jacques Bernard (1658–1718), appointed to a professorship in mathematics and philosophy at Leiden university in 1712, may have kept as consciously a low public profile as did Barbeyrac; he did not in any case share the latter's international renown.<sup>17</sup> The professor of mathematics at the Illustrious School of Deventer, and the only professor from a Huguenot background to be appointed there, was the radical writer Simon Tyssot de Patot (1655–after 1722). Originally from Rouen, he had come to the Netherlands prior to the Revocation; he was sacked in 1727 on account of his moral shortcomings and religious unorthodoxy.<sup>18</sup> Pierre Jurieu, who had been asked for a post at Groningen in 1680 when

---

he was asked for a professorship at Franeker in 1717, but remained in Groningen when he was made full professor there in 1717; Boeles: *Frieslands Hoogeschool*, II, p. 391.

<sup>14</sup> De Toullieu had studied at Franeker under the Dutch law professor Cornelius van Eck, whom he followed to Utrecht and where he (De Toullieu) became a private lecturer; De Toullieu was later nominated for a professorship at Franeker in 1694; see Boeles: *Frieslands Hoogeschool*, II, p. 342.

<sup>15</sup> M. Bakker et al.: *Hugenoten in Groningen*, pp. 161–163.

<sup>16</sup> Elisabeth R. Labrousse: *Documents relatifs à l'offre d'une chaire de philosophie à Bayle à l'université de Franeker au printemps de 1684*, in: Pierre Bayle, *le philosophe de Rotterdam*. *Études et documents publiées sous la direction de Paul Dibon*. Amsterdam: Elsevier 1959.

<sup>17</sup> Bernard's *Traité de l'excellence de la religion* (1714) was translated in 1725 by the (Mennonite, later Arminian) dissenter Jan van Belle (1690–1754). Bernard taught *ethica* and *pneumatica*.

<sup>18</sup> Aubrey Rosenberg: *Tyssot de Patot and his work 1655–1738*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1972.

he was still a professor at orthodox Sedan, was asked again in 1681. However, the request reached him after he had already accepted a professorship at Rotterdam. Jurieu was certainly not a latitudinarian (Arminian students soon boycotted his lectures) and many contemporaries in any event regarded him as an eccentric. Such staunchly confessional pillars of the Leiden theological faculty as Étienne Le Moynes (1624–1689) and Jaques Gaillard (1620–1688) had already left France before the Revocation; they did not contribute to the establishment of a mediating theology.

Other Huguenots had a reputation too tenuous to allow them to criticize the ecclesiastical establishment as Barbeyrac did in 1721. They lacked the necessary acclaim of the church, the scholarly community, or the Republic of Letters. Table I provides a list of Huguenot scholars appointed at Dutch universities and some minor Dutch academies during the first four decades after the Revocation. Apparently Huguenot scholars often had to begin on the lower, cheaper, and less honourable rungs of the academic ladder. Bernard was a lecturer for seven years before receiving his professorship in 1712.<sup>19</sup> Jacques le Mort taught chemistry for 12 years prior to being appointed as a professor of medicine. A request for permission to teach by Pierre de Villemandy, formerly professor of philosophy at Saumur, was turned down by the Leiden curators in 1685; he was given the relatively minor position of regent of the Walloon college three years later.<sup>20</sup> Paul Bauldry, sieur d'Iberville (1639–1706), appointed at Utrecht while still in Rouen, is another case in point.<sup>21</sup> It is not clear why the senate at Utrecht contacted him, but influential people had doubtless been pulling the appropriate strings. Bauldry inaugurated in 1686 as *professor extraordinarius* in sacred history with an address on an apposite topic, *De antiquo more convertandi haereticos, multum dissimili ei, qui nunc viget in Galliis*.<sup>22</sup> Initially he received no salary from the university. The Utrecht magistracy did award him 100 silver ducats in 1692 for dedicating his edition of Lactantius to them; they

<sup>19</sup> Bernard earned the regular salaries of 400 guilders as lecturer and 800 guilders as professor. P. C. Molhuysen: *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidsche universiteit*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1913–1924, IV, pp. 221, 259.

<sup>20</sup> Molhuysen: *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidsche universiteit*, IV, p. 39.

<sup>21</sup> G. W. Kernkamp: *Acta et decreta senatus. Vroedschapsresolutiën en andere bescheiden betreffende de Utrechtsche Academie*. Utrecht: Broekhoff N.V. 1936–1940, II, p. 85.

<sup>22</sup> His Dutch colleague Jacob Trigland Jr., professor at Leiden, inaugurated in the same year with an address *De legitima fidei propagandae ratione*.

then made him *ordinarius* in 1695, began to pay him the (very low) salary of 300 guilders from 1698 onwards, and granted him citizenship in 1701.<sup>23</sup> Pierre Latané—who had studied under Jean Barbeyrac's uncle Charles Barbeyrac, a physician of great repute at Montpellier—was first appointed lecturer in medicine at Franeker in 1689, then *extraordinarius* in 1691, and finally full professor in 1693.<sup>24</sup>

Influential friends were always useful. Étienne Morin was appointed at the Athenaeum in Amsterdam partly because he was recommended by the (pre-Revocation) Walloon preacher Louis Wolzogen (1633–1690), a very popular individual among the Amsterdam élite. Henri Philoponeau, sieur de Hautecour (1646–1715), had been professor at Saumur between 1677 and 1685, when the university was abolished. He was very probably appointed at Franeker as a result of the influence exerted by his later colleague Johannes van der Waeyen on the Frisian stadholder Casimir. The university itself may have wanted to invest in Hautecour in order to attract refugee students.<sup>25</sup> Another Protestant aristocrat, Jacques Alpée, sieur de Saint-Maurice (c. 1620–1700), had been a preacher and professor at Sedan and fled France on the Meuse in October 1685, with two daughters and a substantial part of his flock. He was appointed Walloon preacher and professor at the Illustrious School of Maastricht. Like his correspondent Bayle, Saint-Maurice was unable to climb the academic ladder any further; this may well have been due to the fact that he was an adept of the controversial theology of Saumur.<sup>26</sup>

Huguenot refugees seem to have been largely regarded as eligible candidates when neither Dutch nor German theologians could be had; and even then suitable candidates were not easy to come by. In 1686 there were plans to appoint a second professor, at the Illustrious School of Deventer, and the curators were obliged to look

<sup>23</sup> Lactantius: *De mortibus persecutorum*, ed. P. Bauldry. Utrecht: F. Halma 1692; Kernkamp, *Acta et decreta senatus*, pp. 126, 159, 180–181.

<sup>24</sup> Boeles: *Frieslands Hoogeschool*, II, pp. 330–334; Meylan: Barbeyrac, pp. 30–31. Note that Latané was appointed on a salary of 1,000 guilders, whereas a second professor of medicine, the Dutchman Abraham Cyprianus, was simultaneously appointed on a salary of 1,600.

<sup>25</sup> Boeles: *Frieslands Hoogeschool*, II, pp. 324–329. Hautecour was also asked for professorships at the lesser academies of Deventer and Middelburg. He seems to have been an excellent teacher, but his intellectual legacy consists of only a few disputations; his commentaries on Leviticus, Isaiah and Mark, and essays on Messianic prophecy and the covenant of grace (still extant in manuscript) were never published.

<sup>26</sup> F. Sassen: *De Illustre School te Maastricht en haar hoogleraren (1683–1794)*. Amsterdam, London: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij 1972, pp. 25–28.



for a candidate among the Huguenot refugees. Gisbert Cuper (1644–1716), the erudite burgomaster of Deventer, first inquired after Étienne Morin (1624–1700), who taught Hebrew at the Amsterdam Illustrious School. A month later the curators instructed Cuper to make a proposition to David Martin (1639–1721), formerly a minister in the Languedoc, who was also sought after by the Illustrious School at Nijmegen; but Martin refused. Subsequently Philippe d’Hautecour was sounded out, unsuccessfully. Antoine Pérès (?–1686), ex-professor at Prus Laurent and an excellent orientalist was then recommended, but he died the same year. Philippe d’Hautecour was again approached, and again declined the offer. Finally a certain De Lavernhe, formerly pastor at Castres, was appointed. It is doubtful whether this Frenchman was able to revive the declining theology department of the Deventer Illustrious School; in 1694 it was suggested that it might be better to abolish the theological curriculum altogether.<sup>27</sup> In the end, twenty post-Revocation Huguenots were appointed at Dutch academies (9 of them at Dutch universities) in the four decades following the Revocation. More Huguenots may have filled vacancies at other educational institutions, such as the many Latin schools throughout the Republic; there is as yet little information on this group.

Latitudinarian dissent was possible only outside the formally recognized universities. Those Huguenots who sympathized overtly with religious ideas that fell beyond the limits of Calvinist orthodoxy might have ended up in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. Among Dutch Arminians religious and intellectual restrictions were less severe. The most significant latitudinarian immigrant of the time was, of course, Jean le Clerc; yet he was a disaffected Genevan Calvinist turned Arminian and not a Huguenot. He, too, had to take care not to express his sympathies for Unitarianism all too publicly. A tolerated minority, the Dutch Arminians lacked the direct political backing they needed to carve an openly latitudinarian niche within the politico-religious establishment. On the other hand, they were not silenced either, in what was an eminently Dutch solution to the problem of religious deviance. It had been the standard Dutch policy for a century or so to officially frown upon variations on the religious norm but otherwise indulge them as long as the political and social etiquette

---

<sup>27</sup> Herman H. Kuyper: *De opleiding tot den dienst des woords bij de gereformeerden*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1891, pp. 558–559.

was respected. In result, the indirect influence of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, and thus also of its (mostly covert) Huguenot sympathizers, on the formation of Dutch public opinion was not inconsiderable. This 'clandestine' influence came out into the open only after about 1760, by which time latitudinarianism, whether Arminianism or Huguenot, was on the wane.

Early eighteenth-century Huguenot intellectuals were, moreover, unable to participate in a national academy comparable to the Berlin academy, for the simple reason that there was none. The first Dutch academy of sciences, the *Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen* (*Holland Society of Sciences*), was established as late as 1752. Around the middle of the century, national academies were being founded in many European states, and the Dutch followed the trend. One need think only of the re-establishment of the Berlin Academy as a French-language institution by Frederick II in the 1740s. In the first half of the century, however, the aristocratic patronage needed to found a national academy of sciences was lacking in the Republic, while municipal and provincial governments were quite content to run their own regional universities; only later did a sufficient basis for private initiatives develop.<sup>28</sup> Until well into the 1750s the Republic lacked a suitable state-supported forum for Huguenot intellectuals to put through their ideas as cosmopolitan Protestants rather than as Calvinist academics.

### 3. *Walloon Churches*

The Huguenot emigration of 1685 and subsequent years had a pronounced effect on the Walloon or francophone churches in the Netherlands. No less than 363 of the 600 ministers who had been forced to leave France settled in the Republic.<sup>29</sup> Only one of them entered the ministry of a Dutch Reformed church, because a Dutch baron in one of the eastern provinces backed him, and allowed him to preach in Latin.<sup>30</sup> The rest sought refuge in the Walloon churches.

---

<sup>28</sup> Rienk Vermij: Nieuwe wijn in oude zakken? Iets over plaats en functie van genootschappen in de maatschappij van het ancien régime, in: *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 112 (1999), pp. 24–46, at pp. 40–43.

<sup>29</sup> Bots and Bastiaanse: *Die Hugenotten und die niederländische Generalstaaten*, p. 63.

<sup>30</sup> Fred A. van Lieburg: *Profeten en hun vaderland. De geografische herkomst*

For some decades, the mass incursion of French-speaking Protestants temporarily interrupted the decline of the Walloon churches that had already set in during the second half of the seventeenth century. In the course of the eighteenth century, second- and third-generation Huguenots quietly melted into the Dutch public church.

It is important to realize that, in spite of the decline, the Walloon churches were already firmly in place when the Huguenots of 1685 began their involuntary invasion. The Walloon churches were closely affiliated with their Dutch Calvinist counterparts, whose doctrinal leanings they formally supported until the end of the eighteenth century. Apart from Le Moyne and Gaillard, the Swiss-Dutch divine Frédéric Spanheim Jr. (1632–1701), a pre-Revocation theology professor at Leiden, symbolizes the orthodox confessionalism generally maintained in the Walloon churches. Most seventeenth-century Walloon professors working at Dutch academies had a reputation for orthodoxy. Refugees, however, could not be tested at the borders on their private views regarding the contents of Calvinist formularies. In 1686 the Walloon synod at Rotterdam issued the so-called *Déclaration de Rotterdam*, in which it affirmed its allegiance to the *Canones* of Dort, emphasized compulsory subscription, and announced that any heterodoxy of the Salmurian variety would not be tolerated. Apparently, it was necessary at this stage to reassure the public church, which understandably regarded the influx of ministers schooled at the controversial, semi-Arminian Academy of Saumur with due reserve.<sup>31</sup>

It is in this context of allegiance to orthodox Calvinism that the outstanding literary critic and historian Jacques Basnage (1653–1723) was appointed as a Walloon preacher in The Hague in 1709. Basnage, who partly owed his position to the councillor pensionary of Holland, Anthonie Heinsius (1641–1720), was assigned by the States of Holland to write a history of the United Provinces. As Gerald Cerny has shown, Basnage, while he pleaded for religious toleration, had no intention to pursue doctrinal reforms in the Walloon church itself.<sup>32</sup> Meanwhile, the clergy of the Reformed church closely monitored

---

van de gereformeerde predikanten in Nederland van 1572 tot 1816. s.l.: Boekencentrum 1996, pp. 239–243.

<sup>31</sup> D. F. Poujol: *Histoire et influence des églises Wallonnes dans les Pays-Bas*. Utrecht: Librairie H. de Vroede 1902, pp. 167–170.

<sup>32</sup> Gerald Cerny: *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization. Jacques Basnage and the Baylean Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic*. Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers 1987.

the goings-on in the Walloon churches. When Jacques Saurin defended the controversial notion of ‘beneficial lies’—falsehoods that could be committed with impunity if the general good were thereby furthered—the Walloon church effectively silenced him. The Swiss Huguenot François Bruys (1708–1738), a teacher, translator, and editor of a French-language periodical who supported Saurin’s position on the ‘mensonge officieux’, was even excommunicated from the Walloon church and expelled from the Dutch Republic. The orthodox Calvinist Synod of South Holland formally congratulated the Walloon Synod on the outcome of the affair.<sup>33</sup>

“C’est une chose déplorable,” wrote Saurin to Turretini, not without some exaggeration, “que, dans le pays du monde où la tolérance est portée jusques à la licence la plus effrénée, les Eglises wallonnes adoptent une partie des maximes d’Inquisition (. . .).”<sup>34</sup> Indeed, the Walloon synods were largely successful in silencing or excommunicating renegade Calvinists.<sup>35</sup> Le Clerc’s translation of the New Testament was condemned in 1704, Charles le Cène’s *Nouvelle version de la Bible* in 1742. Jean de la Brune (no dates), Walloon pastor at Schoonhoven, who, apart from contending that pagans could be saved without knowing Christ, sympathized with Socinians and rejected predestination; he was firmly reprimanded in 1691. Gédéon Huet (1654–1729), a minister at The Hague and one of Jurieu’s opponents, was censured in the early 1690s for publishing three treatises on toleration<sup>36</sup> without the church’s formal approbation; suspended from office, he was reinstalled after having shown due repentance. Isaac Jaquelot (1647–708) is another interesting case. After a period as a preacher at The Hague, he left the Republic in 1702

---

<sup>33</sup> N. C. Kist: Aanteekeningen uit de synodale vergaderingen van Zuid-Holland van al het voorgevallene in de zaak en leer der Remonstranten, van het jaar 1619–1777, in: Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis, inzonderheid van Nederland 7 (1836), pp. 1–402, at p. 291. On the controversy itself, see John Christian Laursen: The beneficial lies controversy in the Huguenot Netherlands, 1705–1731: an unpublished manuscript at the root of the cas Saurin, in: Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 319 (1994), pp. 67–103; and Laursen: Impostors and liars: clandestine manuscripts and the limits of freedom of the press in the Huguenot Netherlands, in: idem, New essays on the political thought of the Huguenots of the Réfuge. Leiden etc.: Brill 1995, pp. 73–108.

<sup>34</sup> Quoted by Poujol: Histoire et influence des églises Wallonnes, p. 172.

<sup>35</sup> For the following, see Poujol: Histoire et influence des églises Wallonnes, pp. 173–183; Poujol’s account is based on synodal resolutions.

<sup>36</sup> These include Huet’s Apologie pour les vrais tolérants, pour opposer aux fausses idées que M. Jurieu en a voulu donner dans quelques uns de ses écrits (1690).

for Berlin, where he became court preacher to the Prussian king and openly declared his affection for Arminianism. He had been examined by the church in the 1690s after Jurieu had accused him of deviating from the Trinity, predestination, original sin, and other orthodox doctrines.<sup>37</sup>

Considered as an institution, then, the French Calvinist churches hardly stimulated the dissemination of Huguenot ideas insofar as these were incompatible with orthodox Calvinism. This is not to say that Walloon preachers did not influence Dutch latitudinarian thought on an individual level. The upper class often considered it chique to hold membership of the Walloon churches. Municipal governments sometimes tended to favour Walloon preachers, and were sorry to see them go when they were called to the pulpit elsewhere. The Utrecht administration enticed Louis Wolzogen to leave Middelburg by offering him a professorship in ecclesiastical history as well as a position as Walloon minister at Utrecht. There were frictions between the formal orthodoxy of the Walloon synod and the views of individual preachers. A pamphlet published in the 1660s insisted that those magistrates who secretly entertained Arminian sympathies but kept up orthodox appearances (which they felt obliged to do, since only Calvinists were allowed to enter public office) usually joined the elitist Walloon church. It was called the *pruilkerk* at Utrecht:<sup>38</sup> 'la raison pourquoy on appelle l'Eglise Valonne de ce nom, est parce que ceux qui sont mécontents du Consistoire Flamand [i.e. the Dutch Calvinist church] se rangent à l'Eglise Vallonne,' commented a contemporary.<sup>39</sup>

#### 4. *The Publishing Industry*

The importance of the Dutch publishing industry for the dissemination of latitudinarianism goes without speaking. As for the Huguenots, a multitude of them were engaged in the publication of books, as printers, typesetters, engravers, correctors, and translators. Many of the

---

<sup>37</sup> Walloon ministers who criticized each other too sharply (Elie Saurin and Pierre Jurieu), or who levelled criticism at the Reformed church (Pierre de Joncourt, who criticized Cocceian theologians) were similarly censured.

<sup>38</sup> Kernkamp: *Acta et decreta senatus*, pp. 391–392, note.

<sup>39</sup> François Halma: *Woordenboek der Nederduitsche en Fransche Taalen* (1729); see Matthias de Vries et al.: *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*. The Hague: Nijhoff etc. 1882—(CDRom version, Rotterdam 1995), under 'pruilen'.

periodicals that contributed so forcefully to the moulding of the early eighteenth-century Republic of Letters appeared in the Netherlands. Dutch-printed, French-language newspapers, the so-called *Gazettes de Hollande*, helped to bond the Huguenot communities inside and outside of France. The *Gazettes*, in turn, inspired some journalists to condense the information they gathered and produce compendious works of history.<sup>40</sup> The relatively great freedom of the press and the limited censorship maintained in the Dutch Republic enabled Huguenot journalists, editors, and publishers to both make an income and contribute to the twin cause of scholarship and toleration. One need only recall to mind the way in which the third-generation Huguenot publisher Elie Luzac (1721–1796) shocked his established fellow Huguenots by publishing La Mettrie's *L'homme machine* (1748).<sup>41</sup>

Not that all Huguenot journalists were unilaterally in favour of disseminating latitudinarian ideas. One rather notorious example was the Huguenot Armand de la Chapelle (1676–1730), who had left the London Reformed church for The Hague in 1725 to become a colleague of Jacques Saurin. La Chapelle was an orthodox theologian, a fertile journalist, a translator of Addison and Steele's *The Tatler*, and erudite critic who had no intention of remaining silent when his colleagues overstepped doctrinal boundaries. When Paul Maty, teacher of religion at the *École de Charité* at The Hague, issued an anonymous *Lettre d'un théologien à un autre théologien, sur le mystère de la Trinité* in 1729, La Chapelle immediately retaliated. Maty, who had already joined the Remonstrant Brotherhood, was excommunicated by the Walloon synod in 1730.<sup>42</sup> It is helpful to contrast La Chapelle with his fellow Huguenot Michel de la Roche († 1742). In England, La Roche worked as a translator (he lent a hand to the English translation of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*), and as the editor of several periodicals, including the English *Memoirs of Literature* (1710–1714) and

---

<sup>40</sup> E.g. Henri Philippe de Limiers, *Histoire du règne de Louis XIV* (7 vols., 1717); De Limiers, *Annales de la monarchie française* (1724); François Michel Janiçon: *Etat présent de la République des Provinces-Unies* (1729–1730); Rousset de Missy: *Recueil historique d'actes, négociations, mémoires et traités depuis la Paix d'Utrecht jusqu'à présent* (21 vols., 1728–1754). On the topic, see espec. Gibbs: 'Some Intellectual and Political Influences'.

<sup>41</sup> On Luzac, see Wyger R. E. Velema: *Enlightenment and Conservatism in the Dutch Republic. The Political Thought of Elie Luzac (1721–1796)*. Assen, Maastricht: Van Gorcum 1993.

<sup>42</sup> For which it was formally congratulated by the Synod of South Holland; Kist: *Aanteekeningen uit de synodale vergaderingen van Zuid-Holland*, p. 291.

the French *Bibliothèque Angloise* (1717–1728). The latter periodical was published at Amsterdam; but within three years vehement protestations from the Calvinist clergy, related to his criticism of Calvin, his sympathies for the Anglican church and his positive attitude towards Rome, led to La Roche being deprived of his editorship. The new editor was the orthodox La Chapelle; La Roche promptly found a new publisher at The Hague and continued his work in the *Memoires Littéraires de la Grande Bretagne* (1720–1724). There were frictions enough among Dutch Huguenots, and apparently the Walloon church was able to manoeuvre behind the scenes to prevent the French journals from backsliding into overt religious liberalism.

The francophone Dutch journalist and essayist Justus van Effen took on a role strikingly similar to that of the Huguenot latitudinarians. He translated Swift's *A tale of a tub* (1704) into French in 1721, including a preface which was, in effect, the first serious introduction of the Anglican satirist to the French-reading public on the continent.<sup>43</sup> Swift's criticism of 'fanatic' Calvinists and his common sense approach to what he regarded as superfluous doctrine appealed to Van Effen, who several years later published an anonymous *Essay sur la manière de traiter la controverse, en forme de lettre adressée à Monsieur de La Chapelle*.<sup>44</sup> The tract was a sharp riposte to La Chapelle's condemnation of Paul Maty. Van Effen defended Maty, not by discussing Trinitarian doctrine, but by denouncing La Chapelle's intolerance, laughing off synodal authority, and breaking a lance for freedom of inquiry. In a follow-up to his *Essay*,<sup>45</sup> Van Effen continued his diatribe by making the synod understand right and proper that it was not infallible, that Maty's views concerning the Trinity did not contradict the orthodox view, and that any doctrinal system was legitimate if it was rational, since belief was nothing other than a reasoned understanding of the Bible. An extensive excerpt from the second tract was published in installments in a periodical almost three decades later.<sup>46</sup>

The hegemony of Holland in the francophone publishing business ended with the appearance of Diderot and D'Alembert's *Encyclopédie*

<sup>43</sup> F.J.A. Jagtenberg: Jonathan Swift in Nederland (1700–1800). Een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied van de letteren. Deventer: Sub Rosa 1989.

<sup>44</sup> Piet J. Buijnsters: Justus van Effen (1684–1735). Leven en werk. Utrecht: HES 1992, pp. 239–244.

<sup>45</sup> Suite de l'Essay sur la manière de traiter la controverse (1730).

<sup>46</sup> Vaderlandsche Letter-Oefeningen. Amsterdam: A. van der Kroe and Yntema & Tieboel (1764), II, pp. 367–383, 415–427, 464–472. The editors remarked that the book was small and not well-known, but that its contents were worthwhile.

around 1751. Some francophone periodicals continued to be published in the Netherlands, but not necessarily because Huguenot writers still needed to take recourse to the almost proverbial press freedom of the Republic. When the Georg-August Universität at Göttingen recruited Elie Luzac to publish two scholarly periodicals in 1753, the reasons for bypassing the local academic publisher, the widow Anna Vandenhoeck, were mainly commercial. Vandenhoeck was too expensive, too slow, and too untractable in the eyes of the Göttingen academics. Luzac, on the other hand, was known to produce books that were qualitatively superior to those made in Germany. Of course, there were other reasons for singling out Luzac as an academic publisher. Luzac had a reputation as a publisher of books valued by the progressive Göttingen academics—the *Bibliothèque impartiale*, for example. Policies at Göttingen university may also have been influenced by the widow of the Dutch stadholder, Anna of Hanover, daughter of George II. Luzac regularly attended the stadholderly court.<sup>47</sup>

### 5. *Men of Letters*

As in Berlin, the Huguenots in the Netherlands contributed considerably to the frenchification of the social and intellectual elite. French governors were fashionable, and French culture in general was an object of emulation. Among leading intellectuals, the acceptance of francophone culture was practically a *sine qua non* of membership of the Republic of Letters. The Newtonian philosopher Jan Jacob 's Gravesande (1688–1742) is a fine example of a Dutch latitudinarian who devoted his energy, not to theology but to physics, and was well acquainted with many Huguenots. 's Gravesande, who had studied law at Leiden under Gerard Noodt, collaborated with Prosper Marchand (1675–1756) and Justus van Effen in the *Journal littéraire* (1713–1737). He maintained contacts with the French-English Newtonian Jean Théophile Desaguliers, who immediately translated

---

<sup>47</sup> Rientje van Vliet: *Uitgevers en schrijvers als kempnanen tegenover elkaar. Elie Luzac, uitgever van de academie van wetenschappen te Göttingen*, in: *Mededelingen van de Stichting Jacob Campo Weyermani* 23 (2000), 79–94, at 80–81. Cf. also *Lettres d'Elie Luzac à Jean Henri Samuel Formey (1748–1770). Regard sur les coulisses de la librairie hollandaise du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. Hans Bots and Jan Schillings. Paris: Honoré Champion 2001.



his introduction to Newtonian philosophy, the *Physices elementa mathematica, experimentis confirmata* (1720–1721), into English.<sup>48</sup> The same book was translated into French by a second-generation Huguenot, the Walloon preacher, journalist, prolific translator, and later philosophy professor at the Illustrious School of 's Hertogenbosch, Élie de Joncourt (1697–1765).<sup>49</sup> 's Gravesande had been nominated for membership of the London Royal Society in 1715 by William Burnet (1688–1729), a son of the latitudinarian Anglican bishop Gilbert Burnet, and together with Johann Bernoulli supported Leibniz in his controversy with Samuel Clarke. Voltaire advised Frederick II to invite him to Berlin to become a member of the Berlin Academy.<sup>50</sup>

Academics such as 's Gravesande tended to take refuge from the *odium theologicum* in professionalism and scholarship, and their specifically latitudinarian influence made itself felt only very indirectly, or very gradually. Meanwhile, a substantial section of the intellectual elite was bound to have been familiar with French Huguenot writing, if only by their reading of review periodicals. We may gauge the broader influence of Huguenot writings by glancing at some Dutch translations.

Huguenots above suspicion of disputing familiar doctrines, and who instead produced historical works, or writings of a broadly moral or apologetic nature, were received with much acclaim by Dutch translators affiliated with the Reformed church.<sup>51</sup> Élie Benoit's (1640–1728) *Histoire de l'Édict de Nantes* appeared in Dutch in two costly, illustrated folio volumes in 1696,<sup>52</sup> and Jean Bion's (1668–1735) *Relation des tourments qu'on fait souffrir aux protestants* was published in Dutch in

---

<sup>48</sup> 's Gravesande: *Mathematical elements of natural philosophy* (1720–1721); translated by Desaguliers. This translation was reissued six times in the first half of the eighteenth century.

<sup>49</sup> 's Gravesande, *Elemens de physique demontrez mathématiquement, et confirmez par des experiences* (1746). De Joncourt also translated the *Oratio de evidentia (mathematica et morali)* (1724) into French; he was an editor of the *Journal littéraire*.

<sup>50</sup> C. de Pater: Willem Jacob 's Gravesande. *Welzijn, wijsbegeerte en wetenschap*. Baarn: Ambo 1988, pp. 13–26.

<sup>51</sup> A helpful bibliography on Dutch translations of French Protestant writings, especially seventeenth-century works on piety, is J. van der Haar, *Drielandenverkeer. Bibliografische studie betreffende 1. Uit het Duits in het Nederlands vertaalde theologische boeken. 2. Uit het Frans in het Nederlands vertaalde theologische boeken*, Rump: De Schatkamer 1999.

<sup>52</sup> Élie Benoit: *Historie der gereformeerde kerken van Vrankryk*. Amsterdam: J. ten Hoorn 1696; the publisher dedicated the translation to Cornelis Valkenier, an Amsterdam magistrate.

1714 and 1721.<sup>53</sup> A number of Pierre Jurieu's anti-Catholic and anti-French tracts were translated in the 1680s.<sup>54</sup> So were the orthodox apologies by the Utrecht Walloon preacher David Martin (1639–1721) in the 1720s;<sup>55</sup> later, around 1800, the church historian Annaeus Ypey, in an extensive *historia literaria* of theological writing, would regard Martin as a pioneer of 'popular' anti-Spinozist and anti-atheist apologetics.<sup>56</sup> Also translated were the catechism and the *Abrégé de la théologie* by Jacques Saurin (1677–1730),<sup>57</sup> as well as a lengthy devotional piece by Daniel de Superville (1657–1728), a refugee and Walloon preacher at Rotterdam.<sup>58</sup> The publisher François Halma (1653–1722) was a major translator of writings by first-generation Huguenot refugees. Apart from Jurieu, he translated work by Henri Basnage de Beauval, as well as Pierre Bayle's entry for Spinoza in the first edition of the *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1697) and Isaac Jaquelot's *Dissertations sur l'existence de Dieu* (1697);<sup>59</sup> Halma valued the latter's learning and judgement, and his knowledge of history and antiquities. Halma also translated work by the orthodox Swiss divine Bénédict Pictet.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>53</sup> An earlier edition is *Echt verhaal der tormenten en elenden die de protestanten op de galeyen van Vrankryk moeten ondergaan*. Amsterdam: C. van Essen s.a.; the 1714 and 1721 editions were published in Amsterdam by Douci.

<sup>54</sup> Van der Haar: *Drielandenverkeer*, pp. 113–115, lists 10 different titles, some of which were translated prior to the Revocation. François Halma translated the chiliastic *l'Accomplissement des prophéties* (1686) in 1686–1688. Halma also translated (1681) Jurieu's *La politique du clergé de France* (1681), as well as writings by other Huguenots.

<sup>55</sup> *Traité de la religion naturelle* (1713), translated in 1720 by Jacob Schoolmeester. *Traité de la religion révélée* (1719), translated in 1726. Martin's *La sainte bible expliquée* (1707) was officially accepted by the Dutch Walloon churches.

<sup>56</sup> Annaeus Ypey: *Geschiedenis van de kristlijke kerk in de achttiende eeuw*. Utrecht: W. van IJzerworst and G. T. van Paddenburg 1797–1815, VIII, pp. 153–154.

<sup>57</sup> Jacques Saurin: *Catechisme pour l'instruction des jeunes gens* (1724); translated in 1725. The *Abrégé* was translated in 1724 by J. Schoolhouder. Ypey: *Geschiedenis van de kristlijke kerk*, VIII, pp. 162–163, praised this French Huguenot work above all for its 'popular' style and its 'practical' nature.

<sup>58</sup> Daniel de Superville: *Le vrai communicant, ou traité de la sainte cène* (1718); translated by F. Halma in 1722; reprints in 1725 and 1737. His son, Daniel de Superville Jr. (1700–1762) was an editor of the *Journal littéraire*, and translated work by Gilbert Burnet into French.

<sup>59</sup> *Het leven van B. de Spinoza* (. . .). Utrecht: F. Halma, W. van de Water 1698. Halma dedicated the book to two merchants from Amsterdam, and also included poems by the Dutch Reformed preachers Johannes Vollenhove and Arnold Moonen. His translation was a response to the Spinozist Philopater novels published in 1691 and 1697; cf. J. Duijkerius: *Het leven van Philopater. Een spinozistische sleutelroman uit 1691/1697*, Gerardine Maréchal ed. Amsterdam/Atlanta (GA): Rodopi 1991.

<sup>60</sup> Bénédict Pictet: *La morale chrétienne* (1694), translated in 1720.

The Walloon clergy were especially noted for the quality of their oratory and their progressive preaching techniques—Jacques Saurin<sup>61</sup> and Pierre du Bosc (1623–1692) were sermonizers of international repute. Du Bosc's *Sermons sur divers textes de l'Écriture Sainte* (1687) were translated in the 1740s by Laurens de Haan, who got the ecclesiastical pundit Joan van den Honert to write a preface.<sup>62</sup> Three or four decades later Du Bosc still set a standard to Dutch reformers who tried, rather unsuccessfully at first, to have the Dutch Reformed clergy revise their homiletic approach.<sup>63</sup> The earliest and most ardent advocates of the Walloon (and English) sermonizing methods were the Arminians. It is not surprising to find that the sermons of Henri Chatelain (1684–1743), Walloon preacher in Amsterdam, were translated by Frans de Haes (1708–1761), a wealthy cotton merchant with Arminian sympathies. In a preface De Haes observed with obvious satisfaction that Chatelain, who had fled France as a baby and studied theology at Leiden, temporarily left the Republic for London in 1710 because the English clerisy was more tolerant, and less disposed to scholastic conflict, than Dutch ecclesiastics.<sup>64</sup>

Perhaps the best example of an author who was much translated and very well received in the public church was that unobtrusive minister from Copenhagen, Jean de la Placette (1639–1718). His *La communion dévote* (1695) was eagerly translated by a Dutch Calvinist minister, Johannes d'Outrein (1662–1722), an orthodox Cocceian who himself wrote a devotional bestseller that was translated into French, German, English, Portuguese, and Malay. D'Outrein was personally acquainted with Huguenots in the Netherlands. He disputed with Jurieu over the Genevan psalmody of 1698, which he, in contrast to Jurieu, considered perfectly orthodox. He refuted Pierre de Joncourt's critique of Cocceian theology in 1708. He had met

---

<sup>61</sup> Jacques Saurin: *Sermons sur divers textes de l'Écriture sainte* (1712–), tr. in 1713–1726 by J. Schoolhouder.

<sup>62</sup> A Dutch translation of Pierre du Bosc's sermons appeared in 1745–1746. A list of (translated) sermons by Walloon preachers published between 1750 and 1800 may be found in Jelle Bosma: *Woorden van een gezond verstand. De invloed van de Verlichting op de in het Nederlands uitgegeven preken van 1750 tot 1800*. Monografie & bibliografie (Bibliotheca Bibliographica Neerlandica, vol. 36). Nieuwkoop: s.n. 1997, pp. 120–122.

<sup>63</sup> Du Bosc's sermons on the Letter to the Ephesians (1699) were translated in 1775–1786. The translator was Izaak G. Thin van Keulen (no dates).

<sup>64</sup> Henri Chatelein: *Sermons sur divers textes de l'Écriture Sainte* (1744); translated in 1749. Cf. also Bosma: *Woorden van een gezond verstand*, p. 628.

La Placette himself in Amsterdam in 1714, after La Placette had been relieved of his duties in Copenhagen on account of his health. D'Outrein visited him together with a Walloon colleague; indeed, D'Outrein assures us that La Placette enjoyed an excellent reputation among Walloon Calvinists. The Walloon synod specifically requested the Danish Huguenot to attend the synodal proceedings of 1715; the publisher of the Dutch translation of *La communion dévote*, Johannes van Braam (1677–1751), was an elder in the Walloon church. D'Outrein relates that he had first heard about La Placette's wisdom, intelligence and piety from the princess of Oldenburg, who regularly received D'Outrein and his wife at her residences in Arnhem and Utrecht.<sup>65</sup> In 1738, two of La Placette's refutations of Catholicism received prefaces written by the leading Cocceian theologian of the time, Joan van den Honert, who at that time was involved in a conflict with a Dutch Jansenist over the doctrine of transsubstantiation.<sup>66</sup> The church historian Ypey later praised La Placette for introducing, together with some Swiss writers (B. Pictet, J. H. Heidegger, S. Werenfels), the 'methodical, coherent and practical' study of systematic moral theology into the Netherlands.<sup>67</sup> La Placette's *La mort des justes* (1696) appeared in 1714, his *La morale chrétienne* (1695) in 1718; both were translated by a certain Jakob Schoolhouder.<sup>68</sup>

Ypey generally attributed the quality of Huguenot theological writing to the fact that French Protestants, like Anglicans, had developed their theology free from the negative influence of both the Synod of Dort and Dutch scholasticism.<sup>69</sup> In his view and in that of his contemporaries, the Walloons combined a penchant for practice with an appetite for elegance. Hence the popularity of the Huguenot

---

<sup>65</sup> Jean de la Placette: *La communion dévote* (1695), translated in 1716 by J. d'Outrein. The translator dedicated the book to Catharina Laurentius, the widow of Dirk Munter, a member of the Amsterdam magistracy. Another translation of a pastoral work by La Placette was included in D'Outrein's *Den honig-raat der verdrukkingen*. Amsterdam: J. Borstius 1719.

<sup>66</sup> Jean de la Placette: *Traité de l'autorité des sens contre la transsubstantion* (1700), translated in 1738. His *Traité de pyrrhonisme de l'église romaine* (1721) was translated in 1738; his *Traite de l'aumône* (1699) was translated in 1744 by Laurens de Haan, an associate of Joan van den Honert. See also Van der Haar: *Drielandenverkeer*, p. 142.

<sup>67</sup> Ypey: *Geschiedenis van de kristelijke kerk*, VIII, p. 364.

<sup>68</sup> Schoolhouder also translated work by Saurin and Du Bosc, as well as German writings; he is otherwise known only for writing a handbook for notaries.

<sup>69</sup> Annaeus Ypey: *Beknopte letterkundige geschiedenis der systematische godgeleerdheid*. Haarlem: C. Plaat 1794–1798, II, p. 251.

Jacques Abbadie. His *Triomphe de la religion* (1726) was translated into Dutch<sup>70</sup> by a certain Abraham Moubach, who also translated German writings. Moubach seems to have been personally acquainted with either Abbadie or the publisher of the *Triomphe*. He related that the publisher immediately dispatched the freshly printed sheets to Abbadie, who was then in Amsterdam, as well as to Moubach himself. This enabled Moubach to translate rapidly, so that the Dutch version could appear immediately after the French original. Moubach's translation was specifically aimed at a broader, less educated public, for whose benefit he added some clarifications and a number of poems. He praised Abbadie's book as a learned historical work on the early church and the rise of the papacy, which could serve as an excellent sequel to Humphrey Prideaux's *The Old and New Testament connected* (1716–1718)—another work of historical scholarship translated into Dutch by a dissenter.<sup>71</sup> Later, in 1776, Abbadie's *Traité de la vérité de notre seigneur Jésus-Christ* (1689) was issued in Dutch by a publisher who often produced orthodox books with evangelical leanings, as an antidote to contemporary deism.<sup>72</sup>

Jacques Basnage, who had been one of the fifteen Protestant writers who had responded to Bossuet's *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes* (1688), was better known in the Netherlands for his sequel to Josephus, the *Histoire de la religion des Juifs*, which first appeared in six duodecimo volumes in 1706–1711. This wide-ranging, erudite and original contribution to modern historical criticism, much praised by Voltaire,<sup>73</sup> would stand for more than a century. Its Dutch translation appeared in 1726–1727 in an elegant and costly folio edition of two volumes comprising almost 2,000 pages. It was dedicated to Egidius van Bempden, an Amsterdam magistrate and director of the Dutch East India Company, and contained a list of about 1,200

<sup>70</sup> Translated in 1726 by Abraham Moubach, who also mentions that the Dutch text was corrected partially by David van Hoogstraten. The Dutch translation appeared with the approbation of the Reformed classis of Amsterdam.

<sup>71</sup> Prideaux's work was first in Dutch published in 1723, in a translation by the Arminian Johannes Drieberge.

<sup>72</sup> The translator noted that the Dutch translation of Abbadie's *Traité de la vérité de la religion chrétienne* (1684) was sold out; it had been translated by Pieter le Clerc(q) (1692–1759) from its English version in 1731–1733.

<sup>73</sup> Basnage: *Histoire de la religion des Juifs, depuis Jésus-Christ jusqu'à présent, pour servir de supplément & de continuation à l'Histoire de Joseph* (6 vols., 1706–1707); an enlarged and revised edition appeared in 1716 in 15 vols.; cf. Cerny: *Theology, Politics and Letters*, pp. 181–202.

subscribers ranging from theology professors to magistrates. An abridgement in octavo format of the *Histoire de la religion des Juifs* had already appeared in 1719.<sup>74</sup> The abridgement was based on extracts published every two months by a certain Buscar Graevius (no dates) in the major Dutch scholarly periodical of the time.<sup>75</sup> Since his summaries proved to be popular, Graevius and his publishers decided to re-issue them in one volume, together with an index and an essay on the Ark of the Covenant by the Bremen minister Theodor Hase (Hasaeus, 1682–1731).<sup>76</sup>

Basnage's *Historie de l'église depuis Jésus-Christ jusqu'à présent* (1699, revised and enlarged in 1721), appeared in a Dutch octavo edition only in 1743. The translator was Laurens de Haan, a pupil and friend of Joan van den Honert, who had instigated the translation and to whom De Haan dedicated the work. De Haan's foreword generally demonstrates the interest evinced by orthodox Cocceians for sacred history. He praised Basnage for his impartiality, sincerity, moderation, learning, and experience, as well as for consulting sources and for giving proofs for his various claims. In De Haan's view, Basnage clearly demonstrated that episcopal church government derived from Jews and heathens rather than the New Testament. Finally, there was the *Great tableau of the world*, a providential view of sacred and secular history based on manuscripts given by Basnage to the translator, Abraham Alewijn (no dates).<sup>77</sup> This folio catered not so much to the learned as to the wealthy. The translator dedicated it to the powerful and erudite Amsterdam magistrate Nicolaas Witsen (1641–1717); the publisher claimed that the first two editions totalling 1,500 copies had sold out in 13 months, and that the subscribers were persons of rank and distinction.

Basnage was obviously a writer who found wide approval among the secular and ecclesiastical authorities. While it is difficult to determine exactly where theological, philosophical or historical erudition ended, and where criticism of the religious establishment began, it is clear that the more critical Huguenot writers were predominantly

<sup>74</sup> This abridgement was re-issued in 1735.

<sup>75</sup> In the Republyk der geleerden, of Boekzaal van Europa.

<sup>76</sup> Graevius himself added some comments in his foreword on the tempel built by Herod, citing authorities such as León Hebreo (Judah Abrabanel), Josephus, Zwingli, and Piscator; he was clearly schooled in biblical history. Graevius was not a preacher in the Dutch Reformed church.

<sup>77</sup> † Groot waerelds tafereel (. . .). Amsterdam: J. Lindenberg s.a. [1715?].

received by dissenters—mainly Arminians and Mennonites who stood outside the politico-religious establishment. This was the circle of latitudinarian writers interested also in disseminating the ideas of Gerard Noodt, John Locke, Jean le Clerc, John Tillotson, and Gilbert Burnet. It was in this circle, for example, that Pierre Coste's adaptation of Locke's *Reasonableness of Christianity* was translated. Coste's 'Dissertation où sur les principes du christianisme raisonnable on établit le vrai & l'unique moyen de réunir tous les Chrétiens' was appended to his French translation of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*. Coste's little tract rather overextended the limits of latitudinarianism, in that it pleaded implicitly for the indulgence of Socinianism.<sup>78</sup> Such criticism of the confessional establishment were not common in the Huguenot *Refuge* during the first three or four decades after the Revocation; and in any case, the Dutch translation did not appear until 1742.

### 6. *The German Huguenots*

The eighteenth-century Dutch seem to have had little specific interest in the Berlin *Refuge*. To be sure, Isaac Beausobre's study on the Manichaeans appeared in Dutch in instalments edited by a dissenter (albeit only in excerpts, and in a rather obscure periodical).<sup>79</sup> His sermons were translated in 1777 by a Mennonite, Gerrit van Olst. Beausobre's and Lenfant's French translation of the Bible was rendered into Dutch by Pieter Adriaen Verwer (1696–1757).<sup>80</sup> Significantly, Lenfant's introduction to the New Testament was reissued in 1777, this time with an introduction by Mosheim. The edition also contains two treatises by the Leipzig philologist Johann August Ernesti, whose authority in the Netherlands was growing, and whom the Dutch would soon regard as the greatest exegete since Grotius.

<sup>78</sup> M.E. Rumbold: Traducteur huguenot. Pierre Coste. New York, etc.: Peter Lang 1991; Van Eijnatten: *Mutua Christianorum tolerantia*, pp. 72–79.

<sup>79</sup> According to P. A. Verwer in his edition of Beausobre and Lenfant, four instalments derived from De Beausobre's well-known treatise on the Manichaeans were published in a periodical, the *Leerzame Verlostingige* (1740–1741), which I have not been able to trace.

<sup>80</sup> Translated in 2 vols. in 1753; the translation was dedicated to Jacob Covijn (1696–1746), a Reformed preacher at Amsterdam. Verwer is known for having translated Locke's *Some thoughts concerning education* into Dutch in 1753; he also collaborated with Justus van Effen.

The inclusion of Ernesti's texts signalled the rapid transformation of the Dutch religious and intellectual landscape that had begun in the 1760s. Dutch-language review periodicals started to appear, private societies of interested laymen were founded, practical knowledge and educational ideals were intensively disseminated, and there was a boom in the translation industry. In brief, a new literary public evolved which cut through the old confessional boundaries and evinced a distinct interest in the latitudinarian religious views that had made so little headway in the first half of the century. German Huguenot writers suddenly became well known in the Dutch Republic. The change is illustrated by the publication in 1753–1755 of *De Berlynsche wysgeer, of vorstlyke beschouwer* (= *The Berlin Philosopher, or Royal Observer*) in three volumes, with the epigraph 'Omnia praeclara rara'. The series included, above all, translations of essays by Samuel Formey (but also Frederick II, the Polish King Stanislaus, Maupertuis, Voltaire, Beaumelle, Pope, Rousseau, Noble, Gautier and Marin); it was re-issued in 1760.<sup>81</sup>

The Dutch, however, did not just discover the Berlin Huguenots. They understood that Germany was no longer an assortment of absolutist principalities which had little to offer other than academic law professors, marriageable noblemen, and a cheap labour force for ships sailing to the East Indies. It gradually dawned on them that Germany now stood in the vanguard of intellectual change. During the second half of the eighteenth century, the impact of German thought on Dutch intellectual life was enormous, and exceeded the influence of French and English thought.<sup>82</sup> To put it another way, if there was greater interest now in writings by German Huguenots, and the Berlin Huguenots in particular, this was a result of the Dutch focus on Germany as such.

In the wake of the German revival, and partly because of his contacts with Élie Luzac, Samuel Formey (1711–1797) came somewhat

---

<sup>81</sup> *De Berlynsche wysgeer, of vorstlyke beschouwer*. Amsterdam: F. de Kruyff and A. van der Kroe <sup>2</sup>1760. It was dedicated to Bartholomé Muilman, an Amsterdam magistrate. The second edition contains a preface by 'H. L.', who emphasizes the theologically non-subversive character of the essays.

<sup>82</sup> Joris van Eijnatten: German Paratexts, Book Reviews and Dutch Literary Publicity. Translations from German into Dutch, 1761–1796, in: *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte* 25 (2000), pp. 95–127; Van Eijnatten, *History, Reform, and Aufklärung. German Theological Writing and Dutch Literary Publicity in the Eighteenth Century*, in: *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte/Journal for the History of Modern Theology* 7 (2000), pp. 173–204.



into fashion in the 1760s. He was one of the winners of an essay competition organized by the *Holland Society of Sciences*. According to a contemporary observer, Formey's successful essay on child education contributed substantially to his popularity in the Netherlands.<sup>83</sup> Isaac de la Fontaine (1711–1785), a Dutch Walloon minister, in 1763 translated, abridged and annotated his history of the church, for which Formey thanked and praised him in a personal letter.<sup>84</sup> Parts of Formey's *Philosophe chrétien, ou discours moraux*, published by Luzac between 1750 and 1757, appeared in Dutch translation in a major periodical;<sup>85</sup> another periodical published a précis of Formey's *Histoire abrégée de la philosophie* (1760) in 1761.<sup>86</sup> Other writers of Huguenot origin, related, like Formey, to the Berlin Academy of Sciences, materialized in Dutch translation. For instance, a Dutch version of the *Essai de philosophie morale* (1749; authorized edition 1756) by Pierre-Louis Moreau de Maupertuis appeared in 1773. The *Selected treatises on philosophy and belle-lettres*, an anthology derived from the French-language publications of the Berlin Academy of Sciences published between 1780 and 1795, included essays by Jariges, Béguelin, Beausobre and, above all, Mérian and Formey. The essays had been selected from the *Mémoires* between the 1740s and 1780s, and, interestingly, many were translated into Dutch by theology students.<sup>87</sup> The editor was Johan Frederik Hennert (1733–1813), professor of philosophy and mathematics at Utrecht. Hennert, an avowed disciple of English and Scottish empirical philosophers, was also one of the most important Dutch disseminators of German *Popularphilosophie*, with its penchant for practical morality, intellectual freedom, and bourgeois emancipation.<sup>88</sup> The *Selected treatises* thus included a large number of

<sup>83</sup> Vaderlandsche Letter-Oefeningen (1768), II, p. 1.

<sup>84</sup> A second enlarged edition appeared in 1778. Formey's history was derived mainly from studies by two noteworthy latitudinarians of the first half of the eighteenth century, Paul Ernst Jablonski and Jean-Alphonse Turretini.

<sup>85</sup> The Vaderlandsche Letter-Oefeningen published several essays from Formey's *Philosophe chrétien*: see vols. 1766 and 1767; other essays by Formey may be found in vol. 1768.

<sup>86</sup> Nederlandsche letter-verlustiging. Amsterdam: J. Loveringh, 1761–1764, I, pp. 84–94.

<sup>87</sup> Uitgeleezene verhandelingen over de wysgeerte en fraaje letteren. Utrecht: A. van Paddenburg 1780–1795.

<sup>88</sup> On *Popularphilosophie*, see Johan van der Zande, In the image of Cicero: German philosophy between Wolff and Kant, in: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995), pp. 419–442; Rudolf Vierhaus, Moses Mendelssohn und die *Popularphilosophie*, in: *Moses Mendelssohn und die Kreise seiner Wirksamkeit*, ed. Michael Albrecht et al. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1994, 25–42.

essays by Sulzer. Several writings by the Berlin professor and pedagogue Pierre Villaume (1746–1806) achieved some popularity; but Villaume was far removed from the Huguenots of 1685, and it is telling that, in the 1780s and 1790s, his writings were translated from German rather than French.

### 7. *Orthodoxy, Elitism, Assimilation*

The Dutch Republic already harboured an advanced intellectual culture when the Edict of Nantes was revoked in 1685. The Huguenots entered into a society subject to firm, and possibly increasing, confessional control. Only within strict limits were Huguenots in the Netherlands able to mediate latitudinarian ideas; such Huguenots shared the fate of native Dutch Arminians, who generally fulfilled a role as mediators of latitudinarianism in anonymity, or at least on the fringes of the Dutch public sphere. Huguenot influence on Dutch domestic culture may be summarized under the three headings of outward orthodoxy, francophone social elitism, and, ultimately, domestic assimilation. The suppression of religious latitudinarianism failed dramatically in the second half of the century, when a new reading public developed which rapidly assimilated the formerly francophone Huguenots. This new public was critical of state-supported confessional authority. It also proved highly receptive of German thought, including that of German Huguenots. With some exaggeration, one could say that Huguenot religious liberalism had to be mediated first to Berlin, and Germany in general, before it had any substantial impact on intellectual life in the Dutch Republic.

Table I. Huguenot professors appointed at Dutch institutions for higher education between 1685 and 1725 (only Huguenots who left France in or after 1685 have been included)

Name	Dates	Institution	Faculty and Period of Office
Barbeyrac, Johannes	1671–1744	Groningen (university)	Law 1717–1744
Barthélemy, Jean	?–1701	Maastricht (illustrious school)	arts: philosophy 1693–1701
Bauldry, Paul sieur d'Iberville	1639–1706	Utrecht (university)	arts: historia sacra 1686–1706

Table I (*cont.*)

Name	Dates	Institution	Faculty and Period of Office
Bernard, Jacques	1658–1718	Leiden (university)	arts: philosophy, mathematics 1705–1718 (lecturer until 1712)
Binet, Benjamin	1640–1737?	's Hertogenbosch (illustrious school)	arts: <i>linguae orientales</i> 1722–1737
Esaye, Tugnat	1658–1693	Maastricht (illustrious school)	arts: philosophy 1685–1693
Faucheur, Frederic le	1650–1736	Maastricht (illustrious school)	theology 1700–1736
Fleuri, A. J.	?–1706?	's Hertogenbosch (illustrious school)	arts: Greek 1701–1706
Frescarode, Jeremias	1683–1749	Rotterdam (illustrious school)	philosophy 1713–1748
Gousset, Jacques	1635–1704	Groningen (university)	arts: Greek and philosophy; also lecturer in theology 1691–1704
Hautecour, Henri Philoponeau sieur de	1646–1715	Franeker (university)	theology 1686–1715
Juge, Antoine le	?–1701	's Hertogenbosch (illustrious school)	arts: Greek 1697–1701
Latané, Pierre	1658–1726	Franeker (university)	medicine 1689–1726
Lavergne, Isaac	?–1702?	Deventer (illustrious school)	theology 1686–1702
Mont, Gabriel du	1680–1748	Rotterdam (illustrious school)	arts: <i>historia</i> <i>ecclesiastica</i> , <i>linguae</i> <i>orientales</i> 1724–1747
Morin, Étienne	1624–1700	Amsterdam (athenaeum)	arts: <i>linguae orientales</i> 1686–1700
Mort, J. le	?–1718	Leiden (university)	medicine 1690–1718 (lecturer until 1702)
Rossal, Michael	?–1744	Groningen (university)	arts: Greek 1706–1744 ( <i>extraordinarius</i> until 1717)
Saint-Maurice, Jacques Alpée sieur de	c. 1620– 1700	Maastricht (illustrious school)	theology 1685–1700
Toullieu, Pierre de	1669–1734	Groningen (university)	law 1717–1734
Villemandy, Pierre de	?–1703?	Leiden (Walloon college)	theology 1688–1703

This page intentionally left blank

## INDEX OF NAMES

- Abbadie, Jacques 13, 20, 156, 189, 229  
 Abaelard 164  
 Accolti, Benedetto 175  
 Alembert, Jean Le Rond d' 181, 190,  
 199, 223  
 Alexis, Willibald 22  
 Alpée, Jacques (sieur de Saint-Maurice)  
 216, 235  
 Alsted, Johann Heinrich 55  
 Amelote, Denis 203  
 Amyraut, Moÿse 50f, 82  
 Ancillon, Charles 9, 34, 109, 115, 156f  
 Ancillon, David 40, 109  
 Ancillon, J. P. Friedrich 109  
 Andreas Salomé, Lou 22  
 Angelus Maria Quirini 10  
 Anton Ulrich von Braunschweig  
 Lüneburg 170  
 Archelaus 95, 101  
 Aretino, Pietro 33, 163  
 Argens, Jean Baptiste de Boyer 45,  
 195, 200  
 Aristotle 104, 195  
 Arnauld, Antoine 57, 82  
 Arnold, Gottfried 54, 101, 108  
 Artis, Gabriel d' xif, 156–172, 179f  
 Aschams, Roger 56  
 Astruc, Jean 79  
 Aubignac, François 195  
 Augustinus, Aurelius 93  
 Aulnoy, Marie C. 194  
  
 Bachini, Benedetto 178  
 Baillet, Adrien 191  
 Balzac, Jean-Louis de 197  
 Barbeyrac, Charles 216  
 Barbeyrac, Jean x–xii, 11, 13, 25, 27f,  
 36, 104, 121f, 137–153, 208–216, 234  
 Barnier, Antoine 192  
 Barrin, Jean 178  
 Barthélemy, Jean 234  
 Bartholin, Thomas 178  
 Basnage de Beauval, Jaques 26, 27,  
 31, 105, 179, 219, 229f  
 Basnage de Beauval, Henri 155, 157,  
 174, 179, 226  
 Bauldry, Paul (Sieur d'Iberville) 215,  
 234  
  
 Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb 17  
 Bayle, Pierre ix–xi, 11, 16, 18, 23,  
 25f, 31f, 34f, 38, 54, 90, 93, 99,  
 104–106, 108, 137f, 155–157, 159,  
 161, 164, 171, 174, 178, 191f, 208,  
 214, 216, 222, 226  
 Béard, Anne 168  
 Beausobre, Isaac ix, xiii, 11–13, 17,  
 19, 20, 25, 27, 30–32, 36, 45,  
 89–110, 158, 170, 180–182, 189,  
 199, 203, 231  
 Beausobre, Louis 12f, 17  
 Bekker, Balthasar 208  
 Bempden, Egidius van 229  
 Benoît, Elie 157, 175, 225  
 Bernard, Jacques 156, 178f, 214f, 235  
 Bernoulli, Jean 181f, 225  
 Bignon, J.-P. 178  
 Binet, Benjamin 235  
 Bion, Jean 225  
 Bitaubé, [...] 181  
 Blegny, Nicolas de 178  
 Boccaccio, Giovanni 33, 195  
 Boileau, Nicolas 195f  
 Bonfrère, Jacques 78  
 Bonnet, Charles 199  
 Bossuet, Jacques-Bénigne 26f, 77, 92  
 Bouhours, Dominique 192, 203  
 Boulainvilliers, Comte de 90, 102  
 Bower, Archibald 199  
 Boyer, Jean Baptiste de 195  
 Braam, Johannes van der 228  
 Briasson, Antoine-Claude 191, 201–204  
 Brucker, Johann Jacob 189  
 Bruys, François 220  
 Bucer, Martin 6  
 Budde, Johann Franz 104  
 Buffon, Jean Louis Leclerc de 199  
 Bullinger, Heinrich 6  
 Burnet, William 225, 231  
 Buxtorf, Johannes 55, 61f  
  
 Calixt, Georg 9  
 Calvin, Jean 6, 18, 21  
 Cameron, Jean 51  
 Cappelle, Louis ix, 51, 61–73, 77f  
 Casaubon, Isaac 134  
 Castillon, Friedrich 109

- Castillon, Jean de 109  
 Castillon, Louis Frédéric 109  
 Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de 195  
 Chardin, Jean 198  
 Chauvin, Etienne 32, 115, 124, 170,  
 174, 181, 190  
 Cheke, John 56  
 Chodowiecki, Daniel Nikolaus 22  
 Christine (Swedish queen) 57  
 Chuno, Johann Jacob Julius 118–120,  
 131  
 Chytraeus, David 55  
 Cicero 50, 109, 196  
 Claude, Jean 11, 148  
 Claustre, André de 192, 203  
 Condillac, Etienne de 199  
 Corneille, Pierre 196  
 Coste, Pierre 231  
 Craanen, Theodor 54  
 Crébillon, Claude Prosper Jolyot de  
 195–197  
 Crell, Samuel 43  
 Crespin, Jean 5  
 Crousaz, Jean Pierre de xiv, 11, 196f  
 Cuper, Gisbert 217  
 Cyril of Jerusalem 95
- Daillé, Jean 28, 41, 50  
 Dampier, Guillaume 198  
 Danckelmann, Eberhard von 117  
 Dauber, Johann Heinrich 56  
 Des Vignoles 36, 158, 170, 180  
 Dénina, [. . .] 181  
 Derham, William 190  
 Descartes, René 57, 189  
 Desmaizeaux, Pierre 155  
 Desmarests, Samuel 188, 203  
 Diderot, Denis 109, 190, 199, 223  
 Dohna, Alexander von 135  
 Donneau de Visé 178  
 Du Bartas, Guillaume 195, 204  
 Du Bosc, Pierre 227  
 Du Fresne de Francheville, Joseph 181  
 Du Halde, Père 180  
 Dubos, Jean Baptiste 195  
 Dumont, G. 180  
 Durieux, Tilla 22
- Eccard, Johann Georg 179  
 Effën, Justus van 180, 197, 223f  
 Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried 79  
 Epiphany (Church father) 95  
 Episcopi, Simon 208  
 Ernst August von Hannover 169
- Ernesti, Johann August 86, 231  
 Erasmus von Rotterdam 164  
 Erpen, Thomas 65  
 Esaye, Tugnat 000  
 Estienne, Henri 68  
 Euler, Leonhard 181
- Faucheur, Ferederic le 235  
 Fabricius, Johann Albert 12  
 Fénélon, François de 197  
 Flacius Illyricus, Matthias 64  
 Fleuri, A. J. 235  
 Fleury, Claude 203  
 Frescarode, Jeremias 235  
 Fontane, Theodor 22f  
 Fontenelle, Bernard Le Bovier de  
 178, 190  
 Formey, Jean Henri Samuel xiif, 10,  
 13–15, 17, 34, 91, 98, 180f,  
 183–206, 232f  
 Formey, Johann Ludwig 13  
 Foster, James 211  
 Franck, Sebastian 106  
 Francke, August Hermann 16  
 Frederick II (“the Great”) vii, 3, 10,  
 12, 21, 90, 109, 196, 200, 218  
 Frederick William I (“the Great  
 Elector”) vii, x, 21, 114, 135  
 Frederick William II vii, xiv  
 Frederick William III 115, 118, 120f,  
 124f, 127–135, 156  
 Friedrich Karl von Württemberg 115  
 Fuchs, Paul von 135
- Gaillard, Jacques 215, 219  
 Gallois, Jean 178  
 Gassendi, Pierre 39, 40, 189  
 Gautier, Thomas 129  
 Gibbon, Edward 45, 89, 100, 103  
 Gomar, Franciscus 55  
 Gomberville, Marin L. 194  
 Gomez, dame Gabriel de  
 (Madeleine-Angélique Poisson) 194  
 Gottsched, Johann Christoph 16–18,  
 56  
 Goujet, Claude Pierre 191  
 Gousset, Jacques 213, 235  
 Grabe, Johann Ernst 60  
 Graevius, Buscar 230  
 Gresset, Jean-Baptiste 196  
 Grimmelshausen, Hans Jacob  
 Christoffel von 176  
 Grotius, Hugo 16, 114f, 141, 149  
 Gundling, Nikolaus Hieronymus 38, 180

- Haan, Laurens de 227, 230  
 Haes, Frans de 227  
 Hagedorn, Friedrich von 17  
 Halma, François 226  
 Happel, Eberhard Werner 178  
 Hardouin, Jean 29f, 36, 57  
 Hase, Theodor 230  
 Hautecour, Henri Philoponeau sieur de 235  
 Hautecour, Philippe d' 217  
 Heber, Georg Michael 39–42  
 Heidanus, Abraham 52  
 Heidegger, Johann Heinrich x, 114f, 128, 228  
 Heine, Heinrich 22  
 Heinsius, Anthonie 219  
 Heinsius, Daniel 56  
 Heinsius, Nicolaas 56  
 Heiß, Jean de 193  
 Hennert, Johan Frederik 233  
 Hierocles 106  
 Hieronymus of Prague 32  
 Hobbes, Thomas 143f  
 Honert, Joan van den 227f, 230  
 Huet, Pierre-Daniel 59  
 Hulsius, Antonius 54  
 Hume, David 109  
 Hus, Jan 19, 32  
 Hutchinson, John 64  
 Hyde, Thomas 31, 106  
  
 Iberville, *see* Bauldry  
  
 Jablonski, Daniel Ernst 20, 38, 59, 60  
 Jaquelot, Isaac 25, 220, 226  
 Jesus 99  
 Joncourt, Elie 225  
 Joncourt, Pierre de 227  
 Juge, Antoine le 235  
 Juncker, Christian 164  
 Jurieu, Pierre 10, 92f, 105, 148, 156, 174, 214f, 221, 226f  
 Justel, Henri 40  
  
 Karlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von 78  
 Koenen, Hendrik Jacob 208  
 Körber, Joachim Ludwig 178  
 Krünitz, Johann Georg 15  
  
 L'Empereur, Constantin 62  
 La Brune, Jean de 220  
 La Bruyère Jean de 196  
 La Chapelle, Armand de 197, 222f  
 La Croze, Cornand de 179  
 La Croze, Mathurin Veysière de xiii, 16, 25, 27, 29f, 32–34, 36, 38, 43–46  
 La Court, Johan de 208  
 La Court, Pieter 208  
 La Fayette, Marie M. de 194  
 La Fontaine, Isaac 233  
 La Martinière, Bruzen de 203  
 La Mettrie, Julien Offray de 9, 222  
 La Monnoye 35, 42  
 La Mothe le Vayer, François xi, 40, 183f  
 La Place, Josua de 52  
 La Placette, Jean 13, 20, 227  
 La Roche, Michel de 222f  
 La Roque, J.-P. de 178  
 La Touche, Pierre de 192  
 Lactantius 215  
 Lallement, J.-P. 179  
 Lambert of Avignon 19  
 Lambert, Johann Heinrich 12f, 181f  
 Latané, Pierre 216, 235  
 Lavergne, Isaac 235  
 Le Bossu, René 195  
 Le Clerc, Jean ix, 16, 18, 25, 87f, 141, 149, 155f, 159, 178–180, 192, 214, 217, 220  
 Le Duchat, Jacob 34f, 42  
 Le Fèvre, Tanaquil 178  
 Le Gobien, Père 180  
 Le Guay de Prémontval, André 181  
 Le Maistre de Sacy 203  
 Le Mort, Jacques 215, 235  
 Le Moyne, Etienne 215, 219  
 Lefèvre, Jacques 6  
 Lehmann, Peter Ambrosius 179f  
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm viii, xi, 9, 11, 32, 40, 59, 117f, 140–142, 168f, 172  
 Lenfant, Jacques xiii, 13, 20, 25, 27–29, 33f, 36, 45, 91, 158f, 173, 189, 203, 231  
 Lenglet du Fresnoy, Nicolas 193  
 Lesage, Alain-René 195  
 Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim 46  
 Lessius, Leonard 79  
 Leti, Gregorio 159  
 Lhuillier, [. . .] 181  
 Lieslotte von der Pfalz 169  
 Livius 85  
 Locke, John 137, 145, 147f, 150, 189, 197, 231  
 Louis XIV 3, 19, 150  
 Lussan, Marguerite de 194  
 Luther, Martin 6, 15, 64  
 Luzac, Elie 222, 224, 232

- Mabillon, Jean 29  
 Machiavelli, Nicolò 143  
 Magirus, Johann 115  
 Maillet, Benoît de 198  
 Maimbourg, Louis de 26, 31  
 Malebranche, Nicolas 57  
 Malherbe, François de 195, 204  
 Mani ix, 93–110  
 Marck, Frederik Adolf van der 211  
 Marot, Clément 195, 204  
 Marchand, Prosper 21, 155, 158,  
 180, 224  
 Marivaux, Pierre de 194, 196  
 Martin, David 188, 217, 226  
 Masius, Andreas 78  
 Masson, Ph. 180  
 Masson, Samuel 180  
 Maty, Paul 222f  
 Mauclerc, Paul Emil de 17, 180  
 Maupertuis, Pierre Moreau de 181,  
 190, 203, 233  
 Meckel, Johann Friedrich 12f  
 Menage, Gilles 35, 39f  
 Mencke, Johann Burchard 178  
 Mencke, Otto 16, 178  
 Mendelssohn, Moses 15, 90, 110  
 Merian, Johann Bernhard 12, 109  
 Mersennes, Marin 67  
 Meyer, Lodwijk 55  
 Meyerbeer, Giacomo 3, 22  
 Michaelis, Johann David 79  
 Mill, John Stuart 107  
 Missy, Rousset de 156  
 Möller, Jacob 34  
 Molière 196  
 Mont, Gabriel du 235  
 Montesquieu, Charles de 196, 200  
 Moréri, Louis 191  
 Morhof, Daniel 177  
 Morin, Etienne 216f, 235  
 Morin, Jean 63, 67  
 Morus, Thomas 197  
 Moses 85, 87  
 Mosheim, Johann Lorenz 21  
 Moubach, Abraham 229  
 Moulin, Pierre du 50, 82, 134  
 Münchow, Ludwig Wilhelm Graf von  
 xi, 185f, 205  
 Musschenbroek, Petrus van 190  
  
 Naudé, Gabriel xi, 183  
 Naudé, Philippe viiif  
 Nazari, Francesco 178  
 Newton, Isaac 189  
 Nicolai, Friedrich 16  
  
 Nicole, Pierre 11  
 Noodt, Gerard 208, 224, 231  
  
 Oelrichs, Johann Karl Konrad 124  
 Oldenburg, Henry 178  
 Olearius, Adam 198  
 Oleven, Christoph Heinrich 38f, 42  
 Olst, Gerrit van 231  
 Osterländer [. . .] 14, 15  
 Outrein, Johannes d' 227f  
  
 Pajon, Claude 11  
 Pareus, Johann Philipp 82  
 Pascal, Blaise 92, 197  
 Paul (Apostle) 107  
 Pereira, Bento 78  
 Pérès, Antoine 217  
 Perrault, Charles 174  
 Petavius, Dionysius 67  
 Philoponeau, Henri 216  
 Photius 95  
 Pictet, Bénédicte 193, 226, 228  
 Plato 94, 103, 106, 142  
 Pöllnitz, Karl von 198  
 Poggio Bracciolini 32  
 Poisson, *see* Gomez  
 Polybius 85  
 Prétot, Etienne Philippe de 193  
 Prévôt d'Exiles, Antoine 194  
 Prideaux, Humphrey 31, 229  
 Printzen, Marquard Ludwig von 120,  
 133  
 Pufendorf, Samuel von x, xii, 16, 28,  
 113–135, 137–152, 206  
 Pythagoras 105  
  
 Rabelais, François 195  
 Rambach, Jacob 61, 76  
 Ramler, Karl Wilhelm 17  
 Raynal, Guillaume 203  
 Réaumur, René-Antoine Ferchault de  
 190  
 Recanati, Giovanni 33  
 Reimarus, Hermann Samuel 81  
 Reinbeck, Johann Gustav 189, 206  
 Renaudot, Théophraste 178  
 Restaut, Pierre 192  
 Reuchlin, Johannes 56  
 Reyna, Casiodoro de 159  
 Ricci, Michele Angelo 178  
 Richardson, Samuel 195  
 Ronsard, Pierre de 204  
 Rossal, Michel 213, 235  
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 10  
 Ryssel, Jacob van 162, 179



- s'Gravesande, Jan Jacob 180, 224  
 Sachs, Ph. H. 178  
 Sack, August Friedrich Wilhelm 199, 203  
 Saint-Hyazinthe, Thémiseul de 158, 180  
 Sainte-Maurice, *see* Alpéc  
 Sallo, Denis de 178, 192  
 Sarpi, Paolo 29  
 Saumaise, Claude 57, 134  
 Saurin, Jacques 96, 220, 222, 226f  
 Scaliger, Joseph Justus 65  
 Scharbau, Heinrich 79  
 Schöning, Johann Adam von 117  
 Schoolhouder, Jakob 228  
 Schroeckh, L. 178  
 Schultens, Albert 213  
 Schwimmer, Michael 179  
 Scudéry, Madeleine de 194  
 Seckendorf, Veit Ludwig 31  
 Semler, Johann Salomo 55, 72  
 Seneca 196  
 Senensius (Sixtus of Siena) 83  
 Sévigny, Marie de Rabutin-Chantal de 197  
 Shaw, Thomas 198  
 Sherlock, Thomas 80  
 Simon, Richard ix, 49, 60f, 65–88  
 Smith, Thomas 56  
 Soliman II 34  
 Sophie (wife of the Hannoveran Elector) xi, 169f  
 Sophie Dorothea von Preußen 123, 135  
 Spanheim, Ezechiel ix, 49–88  
 Spanheim, Friedrich 50, 52, 219  
 Spanheim, Friedrich the Elder 50  
 Spee von Langenfeld, Friedrich 176  
 Spener, Philipp Jakob 60  
 Spinoza, Baruch de ix, 55, 84f, 87, 90, 93, 105, 208  
 Staël, Madame de 173  
 Stapfer, Johann Friedrich 199  
 Stosch, Friedrich Wilhelm 44  
 Sturm, Johann Sigismund 117–119  
 Süßmilch, Johann Peter 131  
 Sulzer, Johann Georg 12f, 109, 181f, 234  
 Superville, Daniel de 226  
 Swift, Jonathan 197, 223  
 Tavernier, Jean Baptiste 198  
 Teissier, Antoine viii, x, xiif, 113–135  
 Tentzel, Wilhelm Ernst 179  
 Thevenot, Melchisédech 198  
 Thiébauld 182  
 Thomasius, Christian xi, 40, 76f, 161f, 171–173, 179, 210f  
 Thou, [...] 35  
 Thukydides 56, 85  
 Tietz, Johann Daniel 81  
 Tillotson, John 231  
 Tindal, Matthew 210  
 Toland, John 86, 102  
 Tossanus, Daniel 50  
 Toullieu, Pierre de 213, 235  
 Tournemine, R.-J. 179  
 Trublet, Nicolas-Charles 196, 200f  
 Turretini, Jean-Alphonse 58  
 Tyssot de Patot, Simon 214  
 Uffenbach, Zacharias Conrad von 33  
 Urfé, Honoré 194  
 Uz, Johann Peter 17  
 Vandenhoeck, Anna 224  
 Vaugelas, Claude 192  
 Verburg, Isaak 57  
 Vernet, Jean-Jacob 198  
 Veron, François 41  
 Vertot, René Aubert de 193  
 Verwer, Pieter Adriaen 231  
 Villaume, Pierre 234  
 Villedieu, [...] 194  
 Villemandy, Pierre de 235  
 Voiture, Vincent 197  
 Voltaire (François Marie Arouet) 10, 45f, 96, 98, 196  
 Vossius, Isaak 75, 85  
 Wachter, Johann Georg 45  
 Walch, Johann Georg 190, 203  
 Wartenberg, Johann Kasimir Kolbe, Reichsgraf von 118f, 131f  
 Waeyen, Johannes van der 216  
 Werenfels, Samuel 228  
 Wilkins, John 55  
 William III 54  
 Witt, Johan de 53  
 Witsen, Nicolaas 230  
 Wolff, Christian 17, 189, 203, 206  
 Wolzogen, Louis 216, 221  
 Xenophon 85  
 Ypey, Annaeus 226, 228  
 Zimmermann, Matthias 178  
 Zoroaster 31, 94, 99  
 Zwingli, Ulrich 6

BRILL'S STUDIES  
IN  
INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

56. PRANGER, M.B. *Bernard of Clairvaux and the Shape of Monastic Thought*. Broken Dreams. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10055 5
57. VAN DEUSEN, N. *Theology and Music at the Early University*. The Case of Robert Grosseteste and Anonymous IV. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10059 8
58. WARNEKE, S. *Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England*. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10126 8
59. BIETENHOLZ, P.G. *Historia and Fabula*. Myths and Legends in Historical Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10063 6
60. LAURSEN, J.C. (ed.). *New Essays on the Political Thought of the Huguenots of the Refuge*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09986 7
61. DRIJVERS, J.W. & A.A. MACDONALD (eds.). *Centres of Learning*. Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10193 4
62. JAUMANN, H. *Critica*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Literaturkritik zwischen Quintilian und Thomasius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10276 0
63. HEYD, M. "Be Sober and Reasonable." The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10118 7
64. OKENFUSS, M.J. *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia*. Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10331 7
65. DALES, R.C. *The Problem of the Rational Soul in the Thirteenth Century*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10296 5
66. VAN RULER, J.A. *The Crisis of Causality*. Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature and Change. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10371 6
67. SHEHADI, F. *Philosophies of Music in Medieval Islam*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10128 4
68. GROSS-DÍAZ, T. *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*. From *Lectio Divina* to the Lecture Room. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10211 6
69. VAN BUNGE, W. & W. KLEVER (eds.). *Disguised and Overt Spinozism around 1700*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10307 4
70. FLORIDI, L. *Scepticism and the Foundation of Epistemology*. A Study in the Meta-logical Fallacies. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10533 6
71. FOUKE, D. *The Enthusiastical Concerns of Dr. Henry More*. Religious Meaning and the Psychology of Delusion. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10600 6
72. RAMELOW, T. *Gott, Freiheit, Weltwahl*. Der Ursprung des Begriffes der besten aller möglichen Welten in der Metaphysik der Willensfreiheit zwischen Antonio Perez S.J. (1599-1649) und G.W. Leibniz (1646-1716). 1997. ISBN 90 04 10641 3
73. STONE, H.S. *Vico's Cultural History*. The Production and Transmission of Ideas in Naples, 1685-1750. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10650 2
74. STROLL, M. *The Medieval Abbey of Farfa*. Target of Papal and Imperial Ambitions. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10704 5
75. HYATTE, R. *The Prophet of Islam in Old French: The Romance of Muhammad (1258) and The Book of Muhammad's Ladder (1264)*. English Translations, With an Introduction. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10709 2
76. JESTICE, P.G. *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10722 3
77. VAN DER POEL, M. *Cornelius Agrippa, The Humanist Theologian and His Declamations*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10756 8
78. SYLLA, E. & M. McVAUGH (eds.). *Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Science*. Studies on the Occasion of John E. Murdoch's Seventieth Birthday. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10823 8
79. BINKLEY, P. (ed.). *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10830 0
80. KLAVER, J.M.I. *Geology and Religious Sentiment*. The Effect of Geological Discoveries on English Society and Literature between 1829 and 1859. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10882 3
81. INGLIS, J. *Spheres of Philosophical Inquiry and the Historiography of Medieval Philosophy*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10843 2

82. McCALLA, A. *A Romantic Historiosophy*. The Philosophy of History of Pierre-Simon Ballanche. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10967 6
83. VEENSTRA, J.R. *Magic and Divination at the Courts of Burgundy and France*. Text and Context of Laurens Pignon's *Contre les devineurs* (1411). 1998. ISBN 90 04 10925 0
84. WESTERMAN, P.C. *The Disintegration of Natural Law Theory*. Aquinas to Finnis. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10999 4
85. GOUWENS, K. *Remembering the Renaissance*. Humanist Narratives of the Sack of Rome. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10969 2
86. SCHOTT, H. & J. ZINGUER (Hrsg.). *Paracelsus und seine internationale Rezeption in der frühen Neuzeit*. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Paracelsismus. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10974 9
87. ÅKERMAN, S. *Rose Cross over the Baltic*. The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11030 5
88. DICKSON, D.R. *The Tessera of Antilia*. Utopian Brotherhoods & Secret Societies in the Early Seventeenth Century. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11032 1
89. NOUHUYS, T. VAN. *The Two-Faced Janus*. The Comets of 1577 and 1618 and the Decline of the Aristotelian World View in the Netherlands. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11204 9
90. MUESSIG, C. (ed.). *Medieval Monastic Preaching*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10883 1
91. FORCE, J.E. & D.S. KATZ (eds.). "Everything Connects": In Conference with Richard H. Popkin. Essays in His Honor. 1999. ISBN 90 04 110984
92. DEKKER, K. *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11031 3
93. ROUHI, L. *Mediation and Love*. A Study of the Medieval Go-Between in Key Romance and Near-Eastern Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11268 5
94. AKKERMAN, F., A. VANDERJAGT & A. VAN DER LAAN (eds.). *Northern Humanism between 1469 and 1625*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11314 2
95. TRUMAN, R.W. *Spanish Treatises on Government, Society and Religion in the Time of Philip II*. The 'de regimine principum' and Associated Traditions. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11379 7
96. NAUTA, L. & A. VANDERJAGT (eds.) *Demonstration and Imagination*. Essays in the History of Science and Philosophy Presented to John D. North. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11468 8
97. BRYSON, D. *Queen Jeanne and the Promised Land*. Dynasty, Homeland, Religion and Violence in Sixteenth-Century France. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11378 9
98. GOUDRIAAN, A. *Philosophische Gotteserkenntnis bei Suárez und Descartes im Zusammenhang mit der niederländischen reformierten Theologie und Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11627 3
99. HEITSCH, D.B. *Practising Reform in Montaigne's Essais*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11630 3
100. KARDAUN, M. & J. SPRUYT (eds.). *The Winged Chariot*. Collected Essays on Plato and Platonism in Honour of L.M. de Rijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11480 7
101. WHITMAN, J. (ed.). *Interpretation and Allegory: Antiquity to the Modern Period*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11039 9
102. JACQUETTE, D., *David Hume's Critique of Infinity*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11649 4
103. BUNGE, W. VAN. *From Stevin to Spinoza*. An Essay on Philosophy in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12217 6
104. GIANOTTI, T., *Al-Ghazālī's Unspeakable Doctrine of the Soul*. Unveiling the Esoteric Psychology and Eschatology of the Iḥyā. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12083 1
105. SAYGIN, S., *Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1390-1447) and the Italian Humanists*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12015 7
106. BEJCZY, I., *Erasmus and the Middle Ages*. The Historical Consciousness of a Christian Humanist. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12218 4
107. BRANN, N.L. *The Debate over the Origin of Genius during the Italian Renaissance*. The Theories of Supernatural Frenzy and Natural Melancholy in Accord and in Conflict on the Threshold of the Scientific Revolution. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12362 8
108. ALLEN, M.J.B. & V. REES with M. DAVIES.(eds.), *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11855 1
109. SANDY, G., *The Classical Heritage in France*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11916 7
110. SCHUCHARD, M.K., *Restoring the Temple of Vision*. Cabalistic Freemasonry and Stuart Culture. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12489 6

111. EIJNATTEN, J. VAN. *Liberty and Concord in the United Provinces. Religious Toleration and the Public in the Eighteenth-Century Netherlands*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12843 3
112. BOS, A.P. *The Soul and Its Instrumental Body. A Reinterpretation of Aristotle's Philosophy of Living Nature*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13016 0
113. LAURSEN, J.C. & J. VAN DER ZANDE (eds.). *Early French and German Defenses of Freedom of the Press. Elie Luzac's Essay on Freedom of Expression (1749) and Carl Friedrich Bahrdt's On Liberty of the Press and its Limits (1787) in English Translation*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13017 9
114. POTT, S., MULSOW, M. & DANNEBERG, L. (eds.). *The Berlin Refuge 1680-1780. Learning and Science in European Context*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12561 2
115. GERSH, S. & ROEST, B. (eds.). *Medieval and Renaissance Humanism. Rhetoric, Representation and Reform*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13274 0
116. LENNON, T.M. (ed.). *Cartesian Views. Papers presented to Richard A. Watson*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13299 6